THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC

QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutatory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXVII.—APRIL, 1902—No. 106.

FRANCE AND THE RELIGIOUS ORDERS.

TRUE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE LAW ON ASSOCIATIONS.

THE Law on Associations, recently enacted by the French Parliament, is extremely valuable to students of French history as a fair measure and test of the ideas of civil and religious liberty entertained by the ruling elements in the third Republic, or of those factions which constituted the Ministerial majority at the beginning of the twentieth century.

This important law is worthy of note, also, as having preceded a decided effort to withdraw all State aid from the Church (both Catholic, Protestant and Hebraic), and as making a distinct advance towards a realization of the declared aim of radicals and socialists, separation of the State from the Church; if possible, the destruction of the latter.

While it is true that the French Republic has no official religion, it is also true that the government appropriates annually some 40,000,000 francs towards the maintenance of public worship, this sum being distributed impartially among Roman Catholics, Protestants and Jews in France, and among Mahomedans in Algiers.

In its relations with the Roman Catholic Church the government has, heretofore, professed to be governed by the Concordat, a pact solemnly entered into between Napoleon and Pope Pius VII. As M. Waldeck-Rousseau has expressed it: "Bonaparte found himself before Catholicism. The question proposed itself, to know what would be the rights of the one and of the other. The ecclesiastical

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1901, by P. J. Ryan, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

hierarchy is regulated from the bishop to the officiating priest. There is not a nomination without the government; no parish could be established but with the authorization of the government."

So complete is the dependence of the ecclesiastical hierarchy upon the secular arm that, in 1900, Premier Waldeck-Rousseau, in his capacity of Minister of Public Worship, withheld a year's salary from one archbishop and four bishops who had ventured to criticize, in a private letter, the action of the government in availing itself of an obsolete law to declare judicially the dissolution of the Paris congregation known as the Augustinian Fathers of the Assumption. The mere fact that this criticism was caustic, though dignified, does not change the arbitrary character of this act of the Premier, nor is it justified by the publication of these letters, by the Assumptionists, who have not hesitated to sacrifice their friends in order to arouse public sympathy in their own behalf.

It is not necessary to remind any educated man of the fact that the Concordat was intended to enable Napoleon to reëstablish the Church in France, after its destruction in the Revolution. The essential object of this compact was to place upon a working basis the framework of ecclesiastical organization, the vital components of which were the bishops and parochial, secular clergy.

The first article of the Concordat guarantees that "the Catholic religion, apostolic and Roman, will be freely exercised in France." Referring to religious orders and congregations, Pope Leo XIII., in a recent letter to Cardinal Richard of Paris, declares that: "Born under the action of the Church, the authority of which sanctions their government and their discipline, the religious orders form a chosen portion of the flock of Jesus Christ."

In the Concordat the religious orders were not specifically mentioned or provided for, though Portalis, Lucien Bonaparte, Cardinal Consalvi and Napoleon himself considered them as the natural concomitant of Catholic life and certain to exist. They grew up, after their destruction in the Revolution, quite independent of State support, deriving their subsistence and only aid in religious, educational and charitable work, as in the United States, from free-will offerings of the people.

About all the great teaching orders of the Roman Catholic Church have thus developed educational institutions in France quite free from State aid and not controlled, either by the State or by immediate episcopal supervision, more or less influenced by State pressure or influence. All State education having been long since secularized, this great teaching body aroused the jealousy of secularists who have virtually undermined the foundations of faith in institutions that are sometimes both secular and anti-Christian. This

jealousy has lately been exemplified by M. Poirrier, in taking possession of the presidential chair of the Republican Union of the French Senate. In his speech he said: "For half a century, indeed, two educations, completely different, contend for the mind of our French youth: the one directs childhood by ideas which are the negation of the principles of modern society and which conduce to the supremacy of religious authority over the civil power; the other trains the child in the principles of the French Revolution."

This jealousy has also been illustrated by the speech of M. Leygues, Minister of Public Instruction, in defense of the worst feature of this Law on Associations. Responding to the charge that doctrinal morality could not be found outside of the Church, M. Leygues said: "I respond that there is a moral doctrine outside of the Church. It is the lay doctrine, proceeding from the Revolution which reposes upon liberty of conscience, upon individual liberty, upon property, upon the equality of civil and political rights. The doctrine of the Revolution lays down, as the basis of modern society, all the principles that I have just recalled. It is strange to hear maintained that France, the nation which has emancipated the human spirit by her literature in the seventeenth century, her philosophy in the eighteenth century and her arts and her literature at the commencement of the nineteenth century could not have a doctrine; that the country of Descartes, of Voltaire and of Rousseau cannot find, in herself, directing principles for the government of consciences. I believe, on the contrary, that in this way is it necessary to seek them."

This jealousy and, to some extent, mutual antagonism culminated in the anti-clerical measures of 1879 and 1880. Jules Ferry and M. de Freycinet declared: "We do not wish to terminate the tolerance which covers the existence of all these unauthorized congregations; we wish only to demand of them not to teach." This distinction must be noticed, that while the Brothers of the Christian Schools were then, and are still, recognized by the government as "of public utility," for the primary education of the poor (at no expense to the State), the greater orders, giving secondary or higher education, were not so recognized by the government and are styled "unauthorized" congregations.

The famous "Article 7" of Jules Ferry did not comprehend a scheme of spoliation and robbery. That was left to our day, to M. Waldeck-Rousseau, and to his so-called "Ministry of Republican Defense." Schools and colleges of religious orders were closed up in the time of Jules Ferry, but they were not confiscated by the State.

As a result, however, of the anti-clerical measures of 1880 many of

the great religious orders left France. Many of the Jesuits went to England and a number of their French pupils followed them there. Other orders did likewise and the result to the country was that the tuition fees of wealthy French parents that had formerly been freely given to French religious institutions and spent by the orders in France, now passed out of her borders.

As the better sense of French people revived, or as the anti-clericals lost popular favor, the orders returned and the anti-Catholic measures of 1880 became a dead letter. An important element in their failure had been the absence of spoliation from the indirect plan of virtual banishment. M. Waldeck-Rousseau desired to pass a more effective law and, in 1882, he made an ineffectual attempt to carry it through the Council and Parliament. Later he tried again and failed. He has inaugurated the new century with a project of law which violated both letter and spirit of the Declaration of the Rights of Man (that of 1791), which proclaims all the liberties to-day withdrawn from those who have (according to M. Waldeck-Rousseau) violated the civil code by vows of poverty, chastity and obedience, unless, forsooth, they can wring permission to live under these vows from a ministerial majority of Radicals and Socialists, many of them open infidels and scoffers, all of them anti-clericals, and some of them notoriously refusing Christian baptism to their children and disinheriting (by will) any relative burying their remains with religious rites.

The political mountebanks who have assisted in this great work have, as aptly put, "Republican principles upon the lips, but not in the heart." Article 17 of the "Declaration of the Rights of Man" reads:

"The right of property is an inviolable and sacred right; no one can be deprived of it except when the public necessity, legally established, evidently exacts it, and under the condition of a just and preliminary indemnity."

M. Waldeck-Rousseau's indifference to such fundamental rights was exemplified by the measure first advocated by him in Parliament. In Article 14 of the Law on Associations, as first offered to the Chamber, it was ordained that six months would be allowed unauthorized orders to seek authorization. Orders failing to obtain authorization in that time were to be considered dissolved. Securities belonging to members of religious orders before their formation, or property since falling to members by inheritance, were to be restored to them.

Securities voluntarily given to religious orders could be claimed back by the donor, his heirs or rightful claimants, or by heirs or rightful claimants of a testator at any time during a period of one

year from the judgment of dissolution of the order. After this period, in the terms of the law first proposed: "*The property*" (of religious orders) "*will be acquired by the State as well as the surplus of the capital and devoted to the endowment of a fund for the pensioning of workingmen.*"

Although M. Waldeck-Rousseau was afterwards obliged to modify his first plan of robbing Peter to aid Paul, the odium of this dishonest project of confiscation, as presented to the Chamber and endorsed by the Premier, will forever attach to his name.

This astute statesman foresaw that such a clause would appeal with tremendous force to the cupidity of Socialists, a class jealous not only of all property devoted to religious and charitable purposes, but eager to "revise" private fortunes as well. This class, in former years, M. Waldeck-Rousseau has strongly opposed, and his Law on Associations proposed in 1882, comprising lay as well as clerical associations, was bitterly opposed by the element that now constitutes, in anti-clerical measures, his main reliance and support.

The formal presentation of the law was preceded by an alarmist speech at Toulouse, delivered by the President of the Ministerial Council (M. Waldeck-Rousseau), in November, 1900. In this speech he declared that the property of the religious orders and congregations amounted in value to 1,000,000,000 francs. "The Milliard of the Congregations" at once became a war cry of Radicals, Socialists and anti-Catholic ranters, both in and out of Parliament.

The shameful mendacity of this estimate was soon exposed by examination of the government's own figures, upon which it was alleged to have been based. From these same government statistics it was shown that in this sum were included mission churches of foreign Protestant evangelical bodies, chapels and churches of the Church of England for the use of British subjects visiting France; even Jewish properties were in the list. Of items set down to swell the list were buildings *occupied*, but *not owned*, by religious orders and congregations of the Roman Catholic Church, who there conduct charitable works which they would be glad to enlarge and increase, did they possess any such property. Among the various institutions wholly apart from ordinary educational work are orphanages, homes for the aged, institutions for the instruction of the blind and of deaf-mutes, asylums for abandoned children and refuges for young girls and women rescued from a career of vice, hospitals, etc.

Of course all houses, schools and colleges of the teaching orders of the Church were included. The entire property of every order or congregation recognized by the government as "of public utility" formed a part of the sum total, although it was not the intention or

desire of the Premier either to suppress them or confiscate their property. In the details of the list the buildings of foreign Protestant religious bodies using the English language, which the government regards with indifference, were undervalued, while exaggerated over-valuations were sometimes given to buildings owned by Catholic orders. Local prefects are responsible, probably, for such over and under-valuations.

The exposure of this false total, announced at Toulouse by the Premier himself, came too late to counteract the baneful effect of this useful lie which had time to germinate in the minds of timid Republicans, rabid Radicals and Socialists throughout France before Parliament opened the debate in the early part of 1901.

In presenting this project of Law on Associations, M. Waldeck-Rousseau, as President of the Council, or Premier, declared this measure to be indispensable and warned the Chamber that the Ministry would resign if this law was rejected. This, of course, was an appeal for support from timid Republicans, whose consciences revolted from the extreme form of the measure first proposed, but who saw in a resignation of the Ministry only an aftermath of chaos and confusion.

When all France was distracted by the Dreyfus affair this Ministry was organized from most incongruous elements, but came into being, styling itself the "Ministry of Republican Defense." When, towards the end of the last century, M. Loubet entered the semicircle of the Palais Bourbon with the strange declaration that he had been charged with the government of the country, the extreme Left almost spat at General de Galliffet, Minister of War, open insults coming from Socialistic members; the Radicals repudiated (with the loud voice of M. Mirman) M. de Lanessan, Minister of Marine; a shiver of horror seized the Centre and "Progressist Republicans" at the mere sight of M. Millerand, Minister of Commerce and an avowed Socialist; the Right smiled ironically and shrugged their shoulders.

Nevertheless, this Ministry has survived two years, largely owing to the ability and skill in handling men shown by M. Waldeck-Rousseau. The near approach of the Exposition of 1900 was virtually the salvation of his Ministry. It is poor policy to "swap horses when crossing a stream," and the thrifty French bourgeoisie had too much at stake in the great fair of that year to have it marred by political experiments or changes.

The Exposition is now a thing of the past, but that dread of change remains, and Premier Waldeck-Rousseau forced a supporting vote from many Deputies by making a vote for his law of oppression a vote of confidence in the Ministry. In a choice be-

tween "the devil and the deep sea" many an unwilling Deputy has reluctantly sustained the President of the Ministerial Council.

As a justification of the Law on Associations two dangers to France have been conjured up: the economic peril and the clerical peril. The economic peril was the burden or key-note of M. Waldeck-Rousseau's speech at Toulouse, where was sounded the warning note of the Milliard of the religious congregations. In the matter of the clerical peril, some of the clergy of France having furnished the best kind of ammunition to their enemies, the innocent will now suffer for the follies, or worse, of such ecclesiastics, both regular and secular, as played a discreditable part during and after the Dreyfus excitement. Conspicuous among these latter were members of the Paris house of the religious institute, or congregation, known as "the Augustinian Fathers of the Assumption."

Until relieved of its management by the Pope, these Assumptionist priests conducted a paper called *La Croix*. It was ostensibly a religious paper, but the editorial columns were almost wholly political and noticeably anti-Dreyfusard. From an American point of view it was a narrow, partisan sheet that ought to have discredited either laymen or priests identified with its management. For some reason, best known to themselves, the Assumptionists were bitterly hostile to the Waldeck-Rousseau Ministry. There are houses of the Assumptionists in other parts of France, and their priestly occupants are accused, by their enemies, of having used all their influence to defeat Ministerialist candidates in the Parliamentary elections. There probably is some ground for these charges. When, however, Premier Waldeck-Rousseau asserts, as he has done in the Chamber of Deputies, that the religious orders and congregations constitute a menace to the State, he not only classes all orders with the Assumptionists, but he also says "menace to the State" when he really means menace to the Waldeck-Rousseau Ministry. With the Premier, however, the two terms are synonomous; not so, however, to other people.

During the debate the Jesuit Fathers have been accused of hostility to the government and with infusing into the minds of their pupils a spirit of antagonism to it. Not only has no evidence been brought forward to substantiate these accusations, but their untruthfulness is shown by the fact that the students in Jesuit colleges are sons of men of many different political beliefs and their existence and success, as schools of learning, has depended upon close adherence to scholastic work only, with nothing to arouse antagonistic sentiments between professors and the student body.

The brief sketch just given shows conditions and causes out of which has been brought forward a measure of religious persecution,

fraught with momentous consequences. The law itself can be better understood in the light of this recent past; so, also, can a forecast of the future be made with greater precision.

The first portion of the law makes it legal for associations of lay persons, seeking no standing in the courts as owners of property, or parties to a suit, to exist freely without governmental authorization or preliminary declaration of intention by organizers of the association. This makes it easy for revolutionary Socialists to organize societies everywhere throughout France, to hold conventions and declare all government to be oppression and private property robbery, or advance any social or religious heresy dear to their hearts. Religious associations are specifically excluded from the benefit of this provision.

The exemption from control thus given to secular associations was not part of the original Ministerial project, but was demanded and obtained by the Socialistic element in the Chamber of Deputies.

Associations desiring to obtain a standing at court or a "legal capacity" must file a preliminary declaration with the prefect of the department, or sub-prefect of the arrondissement (ward) where the association is to have its principal seat or headquarters. This declaration must make known the title and object of the association, the location of its establishments, the names, professions and residences of all who, under any title whatsoever, are charged with its administration or direction. This declaration must be accompanied by two copies of the rules and by-laws. This clause applies to lay associations of all kinds as well as to religious orders. All modifications of rules and by-laws must be recorded in like manner.

Every association founded upon a cause, or pursuing an illicit object, contrary to the laws, to public order, to good morals, to the national unity and to the form of government of the Republic, is null and void. The Government is quite free to interpret and apply this clause in any spirit that seems fitting to the Ministry in power.

Article 8 of the law imposes a fine of from 50 to 500 francs upon the founders, directors or administrators of an association formed in violation of the clause last stated, and an additional penalty of imprisonment for any time from six days to one year, with a heavier fine of from 500 to 5,000 francs, awaits the founders, directors or administrators of an association maintained or reconstituted after judgment of dissolution has been pronounced against it.

The last clause of Article 8 of the law imposes a "fine of from sixteen to five thousand francs and an imprisonment of from six days to one year" upon the "persons who will have favored the reunion of the members of a dissolved association, in consenting to the use of a place of which they have the disposal."

It is good evidence of the temper and spirit of the Ministerialist majority that the official spokesman of the commission that framed this law opposed the insertion of the word "*knowingly*," to make it read: "*knowingly favored* the reunion of members of a dissolved association." He gave as his reason that "he desired in this law to subvert that which is of general order in the penal code, that is to say, the proof" (proof of guilty knowledge). His desire was expressed at the private meeting of the Commission, but afterwards quoted in open session of the Chamber and not denied by him, though he then gave other reasons for opposing the insertion of the word "knowingly." The insertion of this word was voted down in the Chamber of Deputies by a majority of fourteen.

Note well this clause. When, by an arbitrary interpretation of Article 3, the government may declare an association to be "in pursuit of an illicit object, contrary to the national unity or the form of government," and ordain its dissolution, any persons who may dare to offer shelter or temporary asylum to members of the dissolved association, if received as a community, are liable to heavy fines and imprisonment.

Priests, or Sisters whose communities may have been considered hostile to the "national unity or the form of government" are to be hounded out of France, and those who give them, as a body, house-room are to be thrown into jail, or can be, at any time.

Dispassionately viewing the causes which are hastening the decadence of France, one might suppose the low standards of public decency in the drama, art and literature would be regarded as matters of graver concern than the political opinions of priests, nursing Sisters or cloistered nuns.

Instead of making France too hot to hold the strongest and best of the teaching orders of the Catholic Church, M. Waldeck-Rousseau might well direct his energies towards aiding any moral forces combatting the ever increasing sensuality of French fiction and the French stage and to lessening the difficulties attending marriage. The social evil and frightful destruction of childlife are evidently matters of minor importance in this *régime*.

During the debate on this law in the Chamber of Deputies several supporters of the Ministry declared vows of poverty, chastity and obedience to be immoral! M. Waldeck-Rousseau himself declared such vows to be contrary to the Civil Code. The immoralities of Paris are apparently not considered contrary, either to the civil or criminal code by this "Ministry of Republican Defense."

In connection with this very Law on Associations Pope Leo XIII. has defined vows of poverty, chastity and obedience to be: "Those sublime, evangelical counsels that our Divine Redeemer addresses,

throughout the course of the centuries, to all who wish to attain to Christian perfection." On the other hand, supporters of the Waldeck-Rousseau Ministry "of Republican Defense" declare such vows to be both illegal and immoral, and the Premier himself has declared a Parliamentary authorization necessary to permit persons who have taken these vows to live under them, since they "are contrary to the civil code." The views of Radicals, Socialists and Republicans who oppose vows, on the vices of Paris, would make interesting reading. No vows of chastity for them, however, or for their sons and daughters.

"Associations composed in greater part of foreigners, those having foreign administrators, or their principal seat in a foreign country and the transactions of which would be of a nature either to disturb the normal conditions of the market, of securities and of merchandise, *or to menace the interior or exterior safety of the State*, in the conditions foreseen by Articles 75 to 101 of the Penal Code, can be dissolved by decree of the President of the Republic, rendered in Council of Ministers. Founders, directors or administrators of an association that will be maintained or reëstablished illegally after the decree of dissolution, will be punished by penalties indicated by Article 8, Paragraph 2."

The article last quoted (No. 12 in the law), as originally constituted, read as follows: "Every association composed in greater part of foreigners, or having its seat in a foreign country, or having foreign administrators, can be dissolved by decree of the President of the Republic, rendered in Council of Ministers." This clause savors more of the King who said: "The State, that is myself," than of a republic, as Americans, or Anglo-Saxons, understand the term. Although ostensibly aimed at religious orders having a general head in Rome, no specific distinction was made between clerical and lay associations. The Socialists became alarmed for the safety of their international associations having branches in Paris. So great was their opposition that a new form was presented and afterwards adopted which also made concessions to Conservatives, who fear strikes ordered by international associations of workmen. Still, the Socialists were not satisfied. M. Vaillant expressed their views with more candor and honesty than the Government has shown. He said, in part: "The article menaces, therefore, above all, international associations of French and foreign Socialists. In these conditions it is unacceptable *to us unless* it designates clearly *those whom it is aimed at*, and that it stipulates that *it is to religious associations* it applies!"

In what sense the Government will interpret this clause, as adopted, in spite of Socialistic fears, may be gathered from the speech, in

the Chamber of Deputies, of M. Trouillot, official spokesman of the Commission that framed the law. He said: "Why are we waging this conflict? In order to prevent the Catholic Church from imposing its will and doctrine upon us. We are fighting *against the monastic army whose headquarters are in Rome* and who seek to enslave us."

Article 13, as adopted, ordains that "No religious congregation shall be able to organize without an authorization given by a law which will determine the conditions of its working. It shall not be able to found any new establishment, but in virtue of a decree rendered in Council of State."

"The dissolution of the congregation, or the closing of every establishment, can be pronounced by decree rendered in Council of the Ministers" (the President's Cabinet).

The presentation of this article was the occasion of an amendment, or substitute, offered by a Socialist, more logical than the Premier and more consistent. M. Zévaès proposed the complete suppression of all religious orders and congregations, whether already recognized by the Government as of public utility, or now existing without recognition. The vows of all religious orders, recognized or otherwise, are precisely the same. If vows of poverty, chastity and obedience are "contrary to progress, to public order and therefore illegal;" if these vows are "immoral and pernicious," as these Radicals and Socialists have declared, then they are equally so in all orders and congregations, authorized or unauthorized.

Here, however, the thrifty soul of the Premier took alarm. He reminded the Chamber that "the number of the assisted, children, the aged and infirm amounts to seventy thousand for the authorized religious congregations. To suppress, brutally, these congregations would be to compromise the law, to render its execution impossible and to impose upon the government a charge it would not be able to support." In other words, all this work is now carried on by private charity. The Premier might have added the number of children, women, of the aged and infirm and of the ill that are assisted and maintained by *unauthorized* congregations and orders.

Fancy, however, these religious orders and congregations seeking Parliamentary authorization from a Ministerialist majority made up of men like M. Gouzy, who declared himself willing to waive, for the present, the wholesale suppression now demanded by M. Zévaès, "*persuaded that these ideas would become, in the near future, the Republican reality!*" This is the future looked forward to by what some Americans curiously style: "The sister Republic across the seas."

The worst feature of the law is contained in Article 14, which ordains that: "No one is to be admitted to direct, either directly or

by another interposed, an establishment of education, of whatsoever sort it may be, nor there to give instruction, if he belongs to an unauthorized religious congregation. The transgressors will be punished by the penalties provided by Article 8, Paragraph 2. The closing of the establishment can also be pronounced by the judgment of condemnation."

This monstrous clause not only deprives every member (male or female) of an unauthorized religious order of the right to teach, but it also makes it criminal for any private school to employ them, and deprives every French parent of the right, within the borders of France, to religious education for his children.

This feature of the law is quite on a par with the infamous verdict at Rennes, illustrating French governmental ideas of civil and religious liberty as well as French notions of justice. In this article M. Waldeck-Rousseau reveals his real purpose, to drive out of France the great teaching orders of the Catholic Church. First, their existence is dependent on the arbitrary will and caprice of the Government, which may, at any time, affect to consider them a "menace to the interior or exterior safety or security of the State," and, being composed in part of foreigners, or having their principal seat in a foreign country (Italy), are subject to dissolution at the pleasure of the party in power.

Secondly, if not crushed by this method, they can only exist in France by virtue of a law of authorization, obtained, if at all, from a Parliamentary majority, now openly hostile to them, made up of men who declare their vows of poverty, chastity and obedience to be "pernicious, immoral and anti-social."

Only by favor of Radicals, Socialists and Communards, such as these, can French parents hereafter give secondary and higher religious education to their children in their own country. After these teaching orders shall have been dissolved and their property sold (perhaps confiscated by the State, posing as a "rightful claimant"), any stray member (man or woman) of a dissolved teaching order who may be employed in a private school will be arrested and prosecuted, criminally, as the article provides. Any school giving employment to a priest or nun in any teaching capacity can be closed at once. And we are told that this is to promote the "moral unity of the country."

It is the fashion in France to herald acts of tyranny as harbingers of peace; to call laws of obvious oppression beneficent legislation. When the President of the Council affirmed to a *Paris Herald* reporter that this law "is a law of conciliation," he deceived nobody, not even himself.

Nothing illustrates better the Jacobin Republicanism of the

present *régime*—a Jacobinism that seeks to create a "moral unity in France" by curbing the wills, violating the consciences of all who think differently from their official masters of the hour. In the vote on Article 14, unwilling and scrupulous Deputies were forced into line by Premier Waldeck-Rousseau's demand for its passage as "a vote of confidence not only in the policy of the Government, but a vote of confidence in yourselves, and above all a vote of *fidelity to the Republican tradition.*"

He should have said the Napoleonic tradition, illustrated by Bonaparte's remark: "In the establishment of a teaching corps, my principal aim is to have the means of directing political and moral opinions." As M. Aynard has noted, while Napoleonic Jacobinism had, perhaps, the excuse of grandeur and glory, the Republican Jacobinism of Waldeck-Rousseau's Ministry of so-called "Republican Defense" gives to the nation but misery and disorder.

Article 15 revives dead ordinances, reënacts a Governmental requirement of 1717, a curious idea of Republican tradition. It was not part of this law, as originally framed, but was readily accepted by the Government, always open for anything that will make it difficult or impossible for religious orders to exist in France, if in competition with the secularized instruction of State institutions.

This clause requires every religious congregation or order to keep an account of its receipts and expenses; to draw up each year a financial statement of the year last expired, giving an inventoried list of its lands, houses, furniture and any funds in hand; also a list of its members, stating not only their patronymic names, but as well the names under which they are designated in the congregation or order, their nationality, age and place of birth, date of entrance into the order, etc.

These accounts and lists must be furnished upon requisition of the Prefect, or his delegate, and any false statement appearing in these documents, or refusal by directors of religious congregations to furnish them upon demand will be punished, criminally, by penalties provided by Article 8, Paragraph 2, of the law (fine and imprisonment).

Article 17 declares null certain acts of the living, or of the nature of a testamentary bequest tending to enable members of religious orders to shelter or shield themselves from the inquisitorial rigor of articles of the law already described.

Article 17 is also more particularly concerned with what are styled "persons interposed;" that is, kindly disposed persons who might desire to lend their names to deeds of sale, gifts, mortgages or any other form of disposal by which religious orders might be able to retain, with their assistance, their own community property, real or

personal, and thus save it from arbitrary sale or forced partition by the State, or confiscation outright.

In any disputed transaction there is, in French common law, a presumption of innocence on the part of the accused, but this article, as first presented, practically denied this common right to anybody having bona fide relations with religious orders or congregations, if suspected of acting as an interposed person. As first framed, the law virtually reputed fraudulent all acts regarding gifts, donations, legacies, realty, owned or occupied, in which members of religious congregations would take part, except the one case where the individual member, acting for himself, would be an heir to donation or bequest in lineal descent.

In spite of the fierce opposition of M. Trouillot, official spokesman of the Commission that framed this law, the saving clause: "Under reserve of proof to the contrary" was inserted to save those who might be wrongly suspected of acting as "interposed persons," incurring otherwise a possible nullification of their various transactions.

Article 18 embodies remnants of Article 14, first presented to the Chamber, and already quoted, to mark the contrast between this measure and that of Jules Ferry, of 1880. The scheme of wholesale confiscation of religious property, first attempted by the Premier, was materially modified by himself and the Commission charged with its original framing. After these modifications had been adopted in the Chamber a determined effort was made to revive the plan of spoliation by a new clause offered in the Senate. By a hard fight the modifications of the Chamber were virtually restored and the following article is the outcome:

"Congregations existing at the moment of the promulgation of the present law, which have not been anteriorly authorized or recognized, are bound, in a period of three months, to prove that they have taken the steps necessary to conform themselves to its prescriptions.

"In default of this proof they are reputed dissolved by right. It will be likewise with congregations to whom authorization will have been refused."

Then follow provisions for legal distribution of the property of dissolved congregations and orders, through the medium of an official named by the judicial tribunals to act as a "sequestration administrator."

Any of this property, real or personal, that can be shown to have belonged to members of religious orders or congregations prior to their entrance into the order, can be claimed back by its former owners, and any securities that may have accrued to them since

by family donation or inheritance will likewise be restored to them.

Any gifts or legacies made to members of religious orders, otherwise than by right of descent, can be claimed back, provided the beneficiaries can prove that they are not persons interposed, after the manner explained in a former article of the law.

Personal property, or goods which may have been given to the orders or congregations, can be claimed back by the donors, their heirs or rightful claimants, or by the heirs or rightful claimants of a testator, in the case of a bequest. Donations made for a specific object, however, cannot be recovered. All such claims must be presented to the official administrator within six months after the publication of judgment of dissolution of a religious order, otherwise they are invalidated. After the expiration of this delay of six months the administrator will proceed to a sale of all real property not claimed back or otherwise exempted, for reasons just given. Amounts realized by these sales, together with the personal property or securities, will be deposited at the Government Deposit and Consignment Office.

The maintenance of the poor, sheltered or cared for in hospitals, orphanages, asylums or other charitable institutions, previously owned or operated by religious orders to whom the Ministerialist majority may refuse authorization, constitutes a first or privileged expense of the liquidation of such properties.

In cases where there is no dispute or when all actions instituted within the prescribed six months shall have been adjudicated, the net capital will be distributed among the rightful claimants. There is a fine chance here for "the State" to pose as a "rightful claimant," an opportunity not likely to be neglected.

An allowance upon the capital remaining free after the various deductions already specified, as a principal, or in the form of a life annuity, will be allowed to members of religious orders thus forcibly dissolved and robbed of their property as a community, in cases where they have no assured means of individual support or can prove that they have contributed, by their personal labor, to the acquisition of the property thus distributed.

While this Article 18, just described and defined, is impracticable in several of its provisions and probably reflects the secret intentions of the Government, it is, nevertheless, not the unblushing scheme of spoliation and robbery first proposed to the Chamber and afterwards attempted in the Senate. The sort of morality held by the Government was fully brought out in a discussion of the claim of the State to the property of dissolved religious orders. M. Waldeck-Rousseau said: "If there remain some goods not having been con-

tributed by a member, by whom could they be claimed back? The congregation had not the right to receive them, to acquire them. It then belongs to the State to receive them by hereditary vocation."

M. Trouillot, official spokesman of the Commission that framed the law, a blatant little egotist, was more explicit. "The fortune of the congregations," said he, "is not in the Sun, it is in the coffers. To whom does it belong, or rather, to whom ought it to belong, when the congregations will be dissolved? To the State; it is to the State that revert, by right, all goods without owner and the goods of the religious congregations are, in the eye of the law, as goods without owner. To whom, in fact, should goods that belong to nobody revert, unless it be to the collectivity represented by the State?

"There is an apparent society, but to constitute a society members are necessary; therefore the society, in fact, does not exist. Of proprietors there is but one, that is the State, which, in the terms of Article 713, is proprietor of goods without owner. In so much as a realty has not been validly transferred, it is the property of the State, which has the right to claim it back. The religious congregations not authorized are not able to acquire; when they acquire they violate the law and the State has the right to destroy their work. These principles are evident. There cannot be transmission of property to the profit of a non-existing congregation. There is jurisprudence!"

Such is the political morality of the Ministry of Republican Defense, as put forward by M. Waldeck-Rousseau, and, more boldly, by his henchman, M. Trouillot, spokesman of the Commission to whom belongs the honor (or odium?) of this law, a measure that takes equal rank with the infamous verdict at Rennes; recalling, also, the revocation of the edict of Nantes.

The promulgation of this Law on Associations was accompanied by a decree of the Minister of the Interior, setting forth the conditions with which all religious orders and congregations must comply when applying for a law of authorization permitting them to exist in France. This decree has been followed by a Presidential decree, drawn up under supervision of the Council of State, covering conditions of application to be observed by all seeking authorization now or in the future and provisions relating to pensions to be given to members of dissolved religious orders, who may be without personal resources or means of support when robbed of their community houses in the manner already described.

In addition to the requirements already indicated by the law itself, the rules and by-laws of religious orders and congregations applying for authorization must contain an agreement of every member of

the order to yield submission to the bishop or ordinary of the diocese in which they live, and formal approbation of these rules and by-laws, given by the bishop, is also exacted, with a declaration of willingness on the part of the bishop to exercise jurisdiction over them.

In the case of new religious orders, or congregations, applying for authorization, besides the preceding requirements other preliminaries are demanded, such as the name of any member who may formerly have belonged to another congregation, detailed information of the title and object of this congregation, of the date of his entrance into and exit from this earlier connection, also his religious name while a member of another order or congregation. Full details are exacted of the conditions of membership in the congregation desiring authorization, the nature of its receipts and other financial data, acts of civil life proposed, etc.

Religious orders, new or old, seeking Parliamentary authorization to exist in France, are required to obtain the opinion, on their application, of the municipal council and prefect of communes and departments where religious houses of the order may be located or contemplated. If these municipal councils happen to have a Socialistic majority, the "preliminary view" they are likely to express on applications from men or women whose vows of poverty, chastity and obedience these Socialists call "anti-social and immoral," can well be imagined. France has recently witnessed adverse action by not a few councils having Socialistic majorities.

The National Government reserves the right to recommend to Parliament the rejection of all applications for authorization disapproved by the Premier and Ministers of the Presidential Council. Where authorization is recommended and granted the decree of authorization will regulate the special conditions under which the religious house or establishment must be operated.

In every private school, college or other educational establishment throughout France there must now be opened a special register, recording the full names, nationality, date and place of birth of teachers and employés, details of their last previous employment and of the places where they have formerly resided, as well as the nature and date of diplomas acquired by them. This register must always be readily tendered to the public administrative, academic and judicial authorities, upon every requisition on their part. Its object is to enable the Government to put under arrest and prosecute criminally any male or female member of a religious order to which the anti-Catholic majority in Parliament may have refused authorization, but still attempting to teach. The school, academy or college which may be found to have employed any stray priest or nun thus circumstanced can be closed at once. Such is civil and religious

liberty under the Ministry of so-called "Republican Defense." God help the Republic that needs or avails itself of such defense!

The measure of liberality which the Government desires to extend to male and female members of religious orders whose houses have been seized and whose charitable establishments have been put in liquidation, by processes already indicated, is shown by the Presidential decree regarding pensions to priests or nuns destitute of personal resources. The decree provides that, where a member of a religious order is unprovided with sufficient means of existence, the allowance is to equal the capital it would be necessary to set aside according to rates of the national fund of pensions to the aged, and to yield an annual life income, proportioned to his essential needs, taking into account his age, state of health and personal resources. In no case is the amount to exceed an annuity of $240. If the applicant for relief has contributed, by his labor, to the acquisition of property of the dissolved religious order, the grant is equal to the sum which he would have been able to husband in living outside of the order had he been placed in the conditions of every free laborer; in any case his annuity is not to exceed the munificent sum of $240!

When it is remembered that the men whom the State plans thus to pension off, when robbed of their houses and forbidden to exercise their office of teacher, are among the most brilliant, scholarly and cultivated priests in France, the spirit of the Government in offering such annuities is proportionate to Governmental ideas of individual liberty. Its generosity is only equaled by its sense of freedom and tolerance.

That France will lose infinitely more than she will gain by this measure of persecution and spoliation is evident to every foreigner who takes the trouble to inform himself upon the subject. The loss of France will be both internal and external. By forcing this issue, as a test of "loyalty to the Republican tradition," M. Waldeck-Rousseau is blindly, stupidly raising a dangerous antagonism between the Republic and liberty, between the Republic, on the one hand, and, on the other, all tolerance, respect for religious belief and the maintenance of the fundamental principles of social order. So much the worse for the Republic, to be henceforth identified with Socialism, incompatible, now, with all the guarantees of civil and religious liberty and soon, perhaps, to be incompatible with respect of private property.

The first scholars of the French Institute, of the College of France, of the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences, of the School of Higher Studies, of the French Academy and of the University of Paris have formally and publicly protested against this infamous measure, foreseeing, as they do, a weakening, if not destruction, of

French influence and prestige in the Orient, where the religious orders, now to be driven out of France, have extensive colleges, schools and missions. Pope Leo XIII. has warned the Government of the same danger. But to what purpose?

Incapable of learning anything from the history of his own country, M. Waldeck-Rousseau demanded and obtained the passage of this law, "for reasons of State." For precisely the same reasons innocent men were sent to the Bastille. To-day, where is the Bastille? To-morrow, where will be Monsieur Waldeck-Rousseau, the evil genius of Republicanism in France?

French Radicals and Socialists hailed the bill with delight as the first step towards a repudiation of the Concordat, towards the destruction of the Church. As a witness to civil and religious authority as against the individualism of the later revolution and commune; to the right of private property, as against the collectivism of the Socialists, the Church is a force with which Radicals and Republican-Socialists have to reckon.

On the purely spiritual side the cry of the Socialists is that of the man in demoniacal possession: "What have I to do with thee, Jesus, thou son of David?"

The priest, monk, nun and nursing Sister each constitute a living protest against the lust and alcoholism that are eating out the manhood of France and that have helped to lower the birth-rate to alarming proportions. These hated orders give testimony also to death, judgment and the wrath to come. For all these reasons Socialists hate them with the hatred that extends also to the Church itself.

M. Waldeck-Rousseau has sought to crush out the only moral force strong enough to resist the encroachments of an overbearing, secularized, apostate State. Not satisfied with that, his supporters now attack the Church itself. What will be the end?

F. W. Parsons.

Rome, Italy.

ORIGIN AND CAUSES OF THE CHINESE CRISIS.

1900.

THE aim of this article is to trace the origin and, principally, to investigate the causes of the bloody drama that desolated the Chinese Empire during the year 1900. To define these causes is not an easy task, as we are not in possession of all the elements of the question. We know many facts from their apparent side only; of the deliberations in the councils of the Chinese government and the intrigues of the palace, so frequently surrounding Oriental thrones, we are ignorant. However, the knowledge which we possess is more than sufficient to enable us to reach very probable conclusions on some points and certain deductions on others, thanks to the revelations of diplomats, the correspondence from China and the letters of Catholic missionaries. These documents have been happily collected and kindly placed at our disposal by Mr. A. Guasco, Secretary General of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith in Paris.

I.

Although the continual agitations of the Celestial Empire have somewhat accustomed us to outbursts of partial revolts, here and there, organized by men without principle and looked upon as rebels, it must nevertheless be admitted that the events of the past few years never prepared us for a violent revolution favored by the government itself.

When the war between France and China broke out, fifteen years ago, missions were not disturbed. In a letter, dated February 1, 1885, and addressed to the Emperor Kouang-Su, Pope Leo XIII. said: "We know that, at the beginning of the war, Your Authority decreed that the Christians should be respected and that no harm should befall missionaries, even the French. . . ." The reply from the Chinese government was favorable.

On September 19 of the same year the Tsong-ly-Yamen* promised to issue proclamations in all localities where missions were established, "informing the people that the aim of Catholic missions is to exhort men to do good and that they are not occupied with any other affair; that the men who profess this religion do not cease to be Chinamen, and that both parties should do their duty quietly without harboring mistrust and hatred against each other."

During the Chino-Japanese War the attitude of belligerents who

*The "Tsong-ly-Yamen" is the tribunal for treating affairs with the Foreign Ministers at the court of Pekin.

were neighbors of missionaries and religious establishments was always courteous. An imperial edict ordered Chinese authorities to protect their institutions; in Manchuria, where the last scene of the struggle between China and Japan was laid, the local authorities watched over them constantly. It was the same everywhere else, excepting Sze-chuan. Perhaps this moderation was exercised to enlist the sympathies of America and Europe when terms of peace should be considered. Whatever the case, the Chinese seemed grateful to Catholic missionaries for their conduct during the Chino-Japanese War; several of these even recorded a mark of their appreciation in the edict of the following year.

This imperial decree, given *motu proprio* March 15, 1899, aims to define the relations between local authorities and the Catholic clergy. It approves the Catholic religion and its cult, recognizes its diffusion throughout the Empire and grants bishops a distinction and power which they never before enjoyed in China. In rank and dignity they are declared equals of Viceroys and Governors. It began to be believed that Christians had finally found peace and liberty in the Celestial Empire.

A very short time afterwards, however, in fact, when the decree was beginning to produce marvelous results, anxiety began to be felt in the legations. Secret societies showed signs of movement and several warnings, given some time before, were recalled. From certain documents, since published, it seemed that a movement beginning from the month of May, 1899, was to be feared; but would it be of any importance? and was more weight to be attached to it than to those that were almost of an endemic nature?

In 1899 a Mongolian chief, the King of Djoungar, who governed seven tribes claiming to be descendant from the army of Gengis Khan, informed Mr. Bonin, the European Charge d'Affaires in Central Asia, "that by reason of troubles which he foresaw in the early future, it would be difficult for him, notwithstanding his good-will, to assure protection and prevent the destruction of Catholic stations established in his territory, for this year (1899) and the year after, and that, in such case, he begged not to be held responsible." Mr. Bonin, in forwarding this communication to Pekin, added the following observation: "This warning agrees with the rumors, learned at the other extremity of China, of a general and speedy uprising against Europeans, Americans and Christians."

On January 4, 1900, a decree published by the *Gazette of Pekin* announced, in pursuance of a telegram from Yuan-che-kai, temporary Governor of Shantung, the murder of an English missionary and prescribed the search for the mandarin guilty of negligence and the assassins. On January 11 another decree, concerning the

numerous societies in the province, stated: "That leads us to consider that a distinction must be made among the societies. Those formed of malcontents who are seeking in an association the union which permits them to foment trouble shall, indeed, surely not escape punishment. Those good men, respectful of their duty, who are practicing the use of arms to be in a position to defend their persons or their families and are uniting several villages to enable them to defend their territory mutually, are acting in a true spirit of mutual protection." Does this decree not contain in vague and equivocal terms a semi-official encouragement to the action of secret societies? At least, so it was understood by several of them, particularly the Boxers.

And so it was understood also by the Ministers of the United States, France, Germany and England; for, a few days afterwards, they presented a petition for the publication of an edict pronouncing the dissolution of secret societies whose development in Shantung and Chi-li was a "serious menace to religious missions and, eventually, to foreigners." The decree was published, but was considered insufficient by the representatives of Christian nations; fresh, though ineffective, efforts were made and several American and European war vessels cast anchor in Chinese waters.

On April 20 the French Minister wrote: "The general state of affairs seems to be improved, but it cannot be considered reassuring. *The blind hostility of the government of the Empress against all foreigners is manifest.* The sovereign is surrounded by mandarins who, on the whole, have been chosen from among those most ignorant of foreign affairs, and most prejudiced against all that departs from Chinese tradition. Her favor is accorded to those who believe in refusing everything to the representatives of the powers. She has just bestowed a high dignity upon Kang-Yi, one of the most bitter against strangers. . . . The secret societies are not ignorant of these dispositions, and those among them that dream only of revolution are ready to profit by the situation. At the given signal they can stir up bloody tumults."

Menacing placards against foreigners were posted in the capital of the Empire itself, something that had not happened for a long time. The situation began to grow critical and Right Rev. A. Favier, Bishop of Pekin, declared that the greatest calamities were imminent. The foreign ministers, it must be remarked, were altogether so surprised by the rapidity of the operations of the Boxers that they did not have time to remove their families to a place of safety. It suffices to say that, in spite of the precursory signs which have just been stated, no one foresaw the horrible storm which has desolated the northern provinces of the Celestial Empire.

II.

It is not our present purpose to write the history of that catastrophe. What has already been published on the subject is more than sufficient to give an idea of the extent of the disaster. Moreover, whatever the opinion of certain writers may be, many facts are wanting to write the history of the Chinese revolution of 1900. The missionaries themselves say that the losses of the Catholic apostolate cannot yet be determined with certainty. In some distant parts of the Empire quiet is far from being restored, and from time to time the press informs us of the sad news of insurrection followed by massacres.

Let us rather try to determine the causes of this catastrophe. Why is the rage of the sects in rebellion so violent against Christians? To what causes is the sudden change produced in the Chinese government, the evident accomplice of these barbarous hordes, attributable? Were the manifestations of sympathy on the part of the Mandchoue dynasty toward Americans and Europeans sincere? Was the promise of protection to their works given seriously or was it only the manœuvre of a government with which duplicity is a habit and lying a means of ruling? Or is it rather a true revolution that has broken out in the north of China, and has the government which signed the decree of March 15, 1899, been the first victim of a reactionary party supported by powerful societies with a prince at their head? To answer briefly it seems that the reasons which may be assigned to the revolution in question are of a threefold nature. The first are of a purely psychological order and are to be sought in the Chinese soul itself; the second may be referred to the action of European powers, and the third, which determine the immediate cause of the insurrection and its character, are to be found in the interior policy of China.

I. It is almost an axiom that a latent hatred against strangers always exists in the heart of Celestials. The yellow race is essentially proud, most proud of its greatness and self-conceived superiority over foreign nations. How could the case be otherwise, when they possess annals dating back to remotest antiquity; when they were civilized whilst others were barbarian; when they can glory in a long line of philosophers, moralists, authors and illustrious scholars; when, in their indefinite list of monarchs, they number sovereigns eminent in the arts of peace and practice of war; when they knew no other nations but their vassals? We, on the other hand, want to see the Chinese lost in admiration before our customs, our traditions, our ancestors, our moral, political, social and industrial leaders. But are we sure of being right in everything? Let

us be candid and inquire if the proofs which we give them in the cities where we are largely represented, of our customs, our honesty, our courtesy and our morality, are always calculated to make them conceive a very high idea of the superiority of Europeans and Americans. Many of those upon whom we are trying to force ourselves give us an example of propriety and personal dignity. An important American review commenting on the Chinese protocol remarked that it was the closing of a chapter of history that has been the reverse of creditable to the Powers.

Moreover, the Celestial Empire, the last survivor of the great States of antiquity, governed, as it were, by the dead, immovable in its past, has preserved many traits of character of the civilizations with which it has been contemporaneous. In general the nations of antiquity professed the deepest scorn for strangers. China feels the same sentiment; and as the yellow race possesses violent passions not governed by any elevating thought and ofttimes excited by misery, it happens from time to time that the Christian people look with amazement on explosions of anger provoking acts of savage atrocity. The history of the massacres of Tientsin (1870) is still fresh in the memory of man. Generally the hatred of foreigners served as a pretext for depredations and acts of brigandage, such as occurred in the province of Szechuan about two years since. The bands of Yu-Mantze ran through cities and villages carrying banners with the inscription: "Death to foreigners! save the dynasty!" and when a bandit, whoever he may be, writes on his standard: "Death to foreigners! save the dynasty!" he will find other bandits to understand him, educated men to encourage him and authorities to protect him either openly or covertly, as circumstances permit.

In 1900 the turbulent undercurrent rose to the surface. Even the regular army, under the direction of high dignitaries, worked to destroy European and American elements with which the government had been negotiating for forty years; and if the legations with the Pei-Tang (Catholic Cathedral) in Pekin were able to resist the combined besieging forces for more than two months, it was very likely because some generals did not obey all the orders received.

II. Writers, not well informed or impelled by hostile intentions, have tried to hold missionaries responsible for the recent events, passing the same condemnation on all ministers of the different creeds. We are not in a position to defend Protestant missionaries from the imputations directed against them. Not being sufficiently versed in their affairs, we cannot point out the mistakes that have been published with respect to them. Besides, their societies see

that they are respected and have already replied to the attacks and repaired the mistakes of a misinformed or ill-disposed press.

In so far as Catholic missionaries are concerned, let our first remark be that they are beyond the reach of the accusation of cupidity brought against missionaries in general. There is not among them an outcast with a burdensome past; no one lazily seeking an easy and lucrative present; no one ambitious for a brilliant future. They are all men who have abandoned everything for all time: fortune, family and country; and in a sublime folly, the folly of the Cross, have gone to live the life of the poor, having many times nothing but a stone on which to rest their heads and being often without the bole of rice necessary for their existence. They are men who know how to suffer and die, as they have proved in the last persecution. Catholic missionaries serve the cause of mankind and Christian civilization by their works of charity; they call down the blessing of the poor, the sick and the orphaned on the generous souls who have sent them on their mission. They faithfully follow the orders of Leo XIII., who in a letter addressed to the Emperor said that "those who labor in the name of the Gospel should refrain from political affairs, and that one of the principal precepts of the Christian religion is to preserve justice in all things, to submit to authority and to honor the King."

To what then must we attribute the outbursts of popular fury against our missionaries and the semi-official protection granted to their assassins? Is the cause found in the nature of the doctrine which they preach? It would seem rather that a people as skeptical as the Celestials would be thoroughly indifferent to the propagation of the Gospel; moreover, their scholars should recognize the fact that our books of religion contain moral precepts which might improve theirs. Many edicts of the Emperors speak with honor of the Christian religion and pay homage to it. Why, then, when millions who profess the religion of Mahomet, together with devotees of many different divinities, enjoy peace, are Christian missions so often threatened and so cruelly persecuted? May it not be because back of the Christian missionary China sees Europe and America, and that in missionaries they recognize the advance guard of armies ready to destroy them?

Before quoting facts to support this suggestion, a few words may be permitted on the question whether the political protectorate is desirable for Catholic missions. Opinions differ and we are reticent about taking any side on the delicate question, as those whom it concerns directly are divided on the subject.

Missionaries are charged with making conversions only among the lower classes. If they alone accept Christianity, it implies that

it is not worth the consideration of the upper classes. True, the conversion of a scholar and, above all, of a mandarin, is a difficult matter, but it is not the character of the missionary nor the grandeur of his Gospel message which is at fault. There was a time when the most brilliant conquests were made among those highest in station in the Empire. At that time the moral standard of the educated class was, perhaps, higher than it is to-day; but at that time, too, the Chinese government did not fear European and American interference in its affairs. Missionaries did not labor under the protection of foreign bayonets and cannon. Cannon and bayonets may be feared in official circles, but it would be difficult to love them. How can the Orientals be made to understand that men backed by naval and military force are not the agents of their respective countries, and that priests are trying to extend the Kingdom of God, preferring, in order to attain this end, days of anxiety on hostile soil to a happy and peaceful existence in their native country? Naturally, there is a confusion of ideas in the minds of infidels between apostolic action and the reasons of political interference when there is a call for it. As for the native converts, they are, of course, looked upon as friends of the invaders and, consequently, as traitors to their country. Would we reason otherwise? Does not the readiness with which the different nations seek the benefits of the religious protectorate for themselves indicate the advantages which they hope to derive from their missionaries, and does it not tend, by manifesting the intentions of the Powers, to cast suspicion on the apostolate itself? Some therefore consider that the use of force is an obstacle to the diffusion of the Gospel.

Others, on the contrary, thinking that the propagation of the Christian religion among a people that yields only to superior physical force will encounter insurmountable obstacles, believe that the regimé of protection is preferable to all others. They remember the innumerable difficulties met with in the past in the preaching of the Gospel and the continual persecutions suffered, together with their long list of evils. The occasional anxieties of the present were then uninterrupted. If we compare the first sixty years of the nineteenth century to the last forty, the advantages of the religious protectorate seem evident; missions, Christians and works have multiplied instead of the former constant struggles, difficulty in reaching souls, repeated new beginnings. It is a law of history, as the learned historian, Mgr. Duchesne, remarks, that the diffusion of Christianity keeps pace with the conquests of Western civilization; and can we doubt that the latter is destined to extend over the entire world? The religious protectorate thus becomes an historical factor destined to bear fruit, for it has come at its appointed time, at the hour when

Western nations and those who owe their origin to them are laboring to impose their customs, their discoveries and their conception of life on the entire world.

Whatever view of the question is taken, it may be found, upon consideration of several facts which we shall give, that certain European governments have somewhat abused the right of the protectorate to obtain undue indemnities and even an unjustifiable extension of territory. At all events, the attitude for several years of Europe, and recently Japan, is one of the principal causes of the political revolution and religious persecution.

For several years the proudest people of the world have been hearing that their country was to be parceled out to other nations. Newspapers have been filled with accounts of possible or probable combinations and have discussed the question of the division of China without the least hesitation. The different European boards of trade in China itself thought out different solutions. Some advocated the open door policy; others that of the sphere of influence, apportioning Mongolia and Manchuria to Russia, Northern China proper to Germany, the valley of the Yangsi, the river of the west and Thibet to England, certain portions of the three southern provinces to France and a part of Fokien and Tche-Kiang to Japan. Some British organs spoke with their accustomed bold self-assurance of the *Egyptianization* of China. "We should organize and administer the valley of the Yangsi, as we have organized and administer the valley of the Nile," they wrote. All the powers were to be satisfied excepting the one among them most interested in being so, China herself. The different countries made contracts with one another and the Celestial Empire defrayed the costs. They mutually acknowledged a sphere of industrial influence and claimed acquisitions under various pretexts, the purpose of which was easily discernible. In a word, there was once a sick man on the banks of the Bosphorus; now there was one more sick still on the shores bathed by the waters of the far east. All those who considered themselves heirs to the seemingly dying man were ready to divide the heritage.

After the treaty of Simonosaki which followed the Chino-Japanese war, Germany obtained two concessions of territory; but it still needed a large port in Oriental waters. For a long time it had Kiachau in view, and was only awaiting its opportunity to carry out an idea entertained since 1870. The opportunity was presented in the massacre of two German Catholic missionaries belonging to the seminary of Steyl, which has charge of the evangelization of Southern Shantung. Fathers Nies and Henle were killed November 1, 1897. Before this double murder the vicar apostolic of Southern Shantung, Bishop Anzer, a Bavarian prelate, had claimed the pro-

tection of Germany. This country was not slow to respond. On November 14 three vessels appeared in the bay of Kia-chau; the citadel was taken and, a few months afterwards, when the squadron commanded by Prince Henry of Prussia arrived, China was forced to come to terms. Kia-chau was ceded to Germany, which also obtained a number of privileges in Shan-tung.

As long as none of the eighteen provinces which form the true soil of China had been touched, it was possible to support dispossessions; but such was no longer the case. An attempt at seizing the sacred ground of ancestors has been made. The Celestials were deeply incensed by the occupation of Kia-chau. Their spirit of resentment gave birth to the sect of "Boxers" who were not long in spreading through the northern provinces, and reinforced by other societies like the "Fasters," were one day to put all to fire and sword.

Without pausing to enumerate the demands of Russia, France and England, the pretensions of Italy and the claims of Japan that followed the important concession obtained by Germany at the point of arms, may we not conclude that the Chinese are justified in regarding Europeans as robbers desirous of enriching themselves with Chinese spoils?

If to spoliation, more or less legitimate, if to the immoderate desire of transporting the riches of the Orient to the Occident, we add the violations of Chinese etiquette, the interests disturbed by European and American industry, the overthrow of customs twenty centuries old, need we be surprised to see this people indignant and ready, when they believe themselves strong enough, to destroy the "foreign devils?" Need we be astonished to see them possessed of a blind hatred against missionaries whom they consider the advance guard of the enemy's army and against native Christians whom they believe to be allies of the stranger, traitors to their own country?

During the war with Japan the Tartars had arrows and flint muskets. Old rusty cannon were mounted on the walls of Pekin and men ignorant of military practices were compelled to join the army. The accounts of the last siege mention Mauser rifles and the latest models of Krupp cannon manned by the Chinese. The Europeans furnished their enemies arms and even taught them how to use them. But if the Chinese believed that the moment had come to throw off the yoke, they were in too great haste. Who knows, however, but they will profit by the lesson they have just received? Who knows but they will not follow the example of Japan, an unknown factor among the Powers a quarter of a century ago, but which to-day is defying Russia? Who can assure us that the twentieth century will not see one of those inundations from Asia into Europe that at different times afflicted ages passed? On

that day the insatiable cupidity of our age will have borne its fruit. The extension of the kingdom of God will be more and more retarded and, as in the last war, the innocent will suffer for the guilty.

III. Finally, another cause of the Chinese revolution and the character which it has assumed may be found in the interior policy of the country. This also explains to a greater extent why the blind rage of the sects in revolt has been directed against the Church and why the Chinese government became their accomplice.

It must not be forgotten that the Chinese dynasty of Ming, succeeded in 1644 by the Manchu Tartar dynasty still on the throne, is far from having lost all its adherents. In fact, the numerous secret societies in China are ramifications of the party of Ming most hostile against the Tartars whom they hope, one day, to drive back into Manchuria. At the time of the great war of Teen Wang (1850) against the court of Pekin, as some years afterwards (1864) the Europeans took the part of the latter. This continues to be the attitude of European powers and the United States who, at the time of the Chino-Japanese War prevented the Tartar dynasty from being replaced by another. American and European missionaries are protected by Mandchoue Emperors, so they are enemies to the followers of the Ming dynasty, as the Chinese who accept their doctrines are also enemies. The reasoning is simple and the partisans of Ming could not forego the opportunity offered to them last year to satisfy their hatred and, perhaps, attain their purpose of overthrowing the Mandchoue dynasty.

Moreover, we have said that the society of "Closed Fists," called "Boxers" by the English, rose in Shantung the day after the Germans took possession of Kia-chau. The "Boxers" were at first recruited from the lower classes. They appealed to the ignorance and fanaticism of the people, assembled in the suburbs of cities and the squares of villages to perform their incantations, contortions and magnetic tricks, pretending that their adepts became invulnerable or were resuscitated within a certain lapse of time. Their aim was clear: "Death to invaders, death to foreigners," and this title included native Christians, whom they called foreigners of the second category. They were not slow in finding followers in higher spheres, where it was quickly understood that they could be made use of. We need not repeat the excesses of all kinds in which they indulged when the revolution broke out and the innumerable massacres that marked their advance toward Pekin. Suffice it to say that when they arrived at the capital, the "Boxers" found in the upper official circles men ready to place themselves at their head and lead them on to the massacre of the "foreign devils." A kind of legal leaders had succeeded to the friends of foreigners who had governed China since 1860 and had directed it toward progress.

For many years Prince Tuan had lived away from court, almost an exile in Moukden. He had tasted the bitterness of a double denial of justice; an exclusion from the regency to which his father was subjected and his own exclusion from the throne. As the Emperor, Kouang-Su, had no son, it happened that a son of Tuan became heir presumptive. Thus it was that Tuan, who was ignorant of the events of the past forty years, returned to Pekin. All the malcontents, all those who pretended to have been wronged by foreign innovations, thronged around this prince who came back with his ignorance and his hatred. The Empress yielded to the ascendancy of this great personage and seemed struggling between two contrary tendencies, which explains her contradictory edicts. On the one hand she had reason to fear the Europeans; on the other, she had reason to tremble before a party supported by hordes so audacious, so numerous and animated by such a ferocious fanaticism. English dispatches frequently represented the Empress, Si-tai-heon, as retrogressive; we incline to believe that the Empress and Emperor were simply the first prisoners of Prince Tuan, father of the heir presumptive to the throne, who has certainly played the principal part in the horrible drama enacted.

What consequences will the sad events have for the future, the causes of which we have endeavored to determine? It is difficult to foresee. There are many who hardly entertain any hope for the future of China, and not a few who fear another anti-foreign and anti-Christian movement. Such is not the opinion of the Catholic Bishop of Pekin, the Right Rev. A. Favier. In a letter lately published in the *New York Sun* (November 3, 1901), he seems to be full of confidence for the future of the Empire and the Christian missions. According to him, there may be here and there occasional outbreaks. Personal revenges and local annoyances will doubtless harass Christian settlements now and then, but no general persecution is anticipated. It will be long before China exposes itself to another catastrophe similar to that of 1900, in which Empire and dynasty came very near foundering.

We are informed that the Christian missions are fast recovering from their losses. The blood of martyrs and the sublime attitude of Catholics face to face with death or spoliation are already producing fruit, and every day some new members are entered in the roll of catechumens, while Christians and pagans are living in perfect peace and harmony. May such a state of affairs continue, and sanguinary persecution never disgrace the oldest Empire of the world!

J. Freri.

Baltimore, Md.

THE TRUE AUTHORS OF ENGLAND'S REFORMATION.

PROTESTANT ecclesiastical historians candidly admit that Convocation was never consulted upon the various doctrinal alterations introduced into the Church of England during the short, but eventful reign, of Edward VI. They even inform us that Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, Bonner of London, Tunstal of Durham, Voysey of Exeter, Heath of Worcester and Day of Chichester were deprived of their sees on account of their opposition to the New Gospel, introduced by the Council; that Rugg of Norwich resigned his see to save his conscience, and that Kitchen of Llandaff, Salcot of Salisbury and Sampson of Lichfield showed such sullen unwillingness to accept the new code of religion that the Council punished them by practically confiscating the revenues of their respective sees. It is furthermore narrated that Thirlby of Westminster, Skyp of Hereford, Aldrick of Carlisle, King of Oxford, and Gooderick of Ely, all of whom held Catholic opinions, sacrificed their consciences in order to retain their sees. Only four bishops out of the whole hierarchy of England, viz.: Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury; Ridley, Bishop of Rochester; Holbeach, of Lincoln, and Ferrars, of St. Davids, willingly espoused the cause of the Reformation in the beginning of this reign.

Any impartial reader of history can form a true idea of the unwillingness of the English Bishops, as a body, to accept the complete "reformation" contained in the second Book of Common Prayer, with the ordinal and Articles, by reading the debate which took place in the House of Lords, and examining the votes recorded before the comparatively mild reforms contained in the First Common Prayer Book, received the sanction of Parliament. Although thirteen bishops, either personally or by proxy, voted in its favor, yet, notwithstanding the frowns of Somerset and the threats of Warwick, no less than ten openly opposed it. Gardiner, who was then in prison, and Kitchen, an absentee, whose Catholic views were notorious, certainly agreed with the minority, as did, no doubt, the other absent bishops, for had these been of one mind with the majority, it is difficult to conceive that they would have refrained from recording votes which must have won them the good will and gratitude of the Council. The whole weight of evidence, therefore, tends to show that the English bishops, as a body, were opposed to the reformation, even in its mildest form.

The proofs that the people of England, both at that time and during the previous reigns, still loved the faith of their fathers, are so convincing that they can be called in question only by those who are

ready to maintain that the general rioting, culminating in open rebellion, provoked by the reformation, were infallible signs of the people's love for the new religion.

The insurrection in Lincolnshire and the later and more formidable rebellion of the Pilgrims of Grace during the reign of Henry VIII., and the written statement of their grievances drawn up by the insurgents, make clearly manifest the Catholic spirit of the country. In Edward the Sixth's reign the attempts to force the latest reforms provoked insurrections in the counties of Devonshire, Cornwall, Kent, Sussex, Wiltshire, Hampshire, Warwickshire, Worcestershire, Rutlandshire, Oxfordshire, Hertfordshire and Norfolkshire. Sir William Herbert, commanding the Royal troops in Wiltshire, and Lord Grey in Oxfordshire, easily suppressed the tumults in these two counties. But the men of Devon, exasperated by the promulgation of the First Common Prayer Book, gave vent to their anger in a rebellion so formidable that Lord Russell, the leader of the Royal troops, finding himself utterly powerless to suppress it, temporized with the insurgents by offering to submit their grievances to the Council. Unsatisfied by the King's and Cranmer's answers to their petition, the insurgents besieged Exeter. In Norfolk 20,000 insurgents, under the leadership of Kent, succeeded in driving the Marquis of Northampton, with the King's troops beyond the borders of the county. The various insurrections were, however, eventually suppressed with the aid of German and Italian mercenaries, whose services the government, anticipating the likelihood of outbreaks, had secured in the commencement of King Edward's reign.

The principal grievances of the insurgents are stated by Collier (vol. v., p. 331) and clearly reveal the popular opinion concerning the so-called "blessings of the reformation." "They complained that they dragged out a wretched life, and were treated little better than beasts of burden. However, the miseries of this world would not always last, and therefore ought to be borne with patience, if that were the worse of the case. But when the loss of their souls was the question, the ruin from that quarter ought to be prevented at the utmost hazard. Now here they had the unhappiness to be concerned, for the holy ceremonies of antiquity were abolished and a new face and form of religion forced upon them. That by compliance with these innovations, they should fall under the terrors of the other world, and the hardships of this life would be succeeded by the unsupportable punishment of the damned. As things stood, therefore, they had no remedy left them but marching up to the court and rescuing the King from evil counsellors—from men who took advantage of his minority; who, under the covert of Royal authority, plunder the Church and ruin the Kingdom, who have no

other aim but wealth and dominion and making their fortune out of the public calamity."

It is with feelings of painful surprise that we read in Heylyn's narrative a statement to the effect that the members of both Houses of Parliament, though favorable to the ancient faith, were induced by mercenary motives to abet the reformers. These are his words: "Though a great part of the nobility, and not a few of the chief gentry, were cordially affected to the Church of Rome, yet they were willing to give way to all such acts and statutes as were made against it, out of fear of losing such church land as they were possessed of, if that religion should prevail again. As to the rest, who either were to make or improve their fortunes, there is no question, but that they came resolved to further such a reformation as should most visibly conduce to the advancement of their several ends." (Ed. vi., p. 48.)

It is open to all who wish to test the truth of the grave statements just made to consult the "History of the Reformation of the Church of England," written by a learned Anglican divine, Peter Heylyn, D. D., chaplain in ordinary to James the First, or the "History of the Church of Great Britain," by Jeremy Collier, a still more distinguished clergyman of the same Church, both of whom stand in the first rank of able and learned Church historians.

All the quotations given from the writings of the Fathers of the early Church can easily be verified, as there are Protestant translations of the original writings, which will be found in the Ante-Nicene Library published by Clark, of Edinburgh, in 1870.

As there is no authentic translation of the Thirteenth Canon of the Council of Nice, the original is given in Latin. Fleury's ecclesiastical history from A. D. 381 to 400 is certainly quoted, but only from the translation published by Parker, Oxford, 1842, given here.

Edward VI. was but a boy in his ninth year when he ascended the throne. By his father's will no less than sixteen executors, with equal powers, had been appointed to carry out the provisions of the will until the young Monarch should attain his majority. In spite, however, of these, the Earl of Hertford, Edward's uncle, was elected by the Council of Executors to be "protector of the King's realm and governor of his person," but only on the express condition, which indeed was soon ignored, that he should not do any act but by the advice and consent of the other executors. Soon after the Royal coronation, the Lord Protector was created Duke of Somerset and Earl Marshal. Having secured for himself by Royal letters patent fixity of tenure in his high office during the King's minority, he next provided to secure for himself complete control over the Council by the simple process of nominating an overwhelming number of his followers as its members.

Henry VIII., satisfied with being acknowledged as "Supreme Head on Earth of the Church in England," had made no alteration in the regular system of divine worship, but on the accession of Edward VI., the Lord Protector, a Calvinist at heart, knowing well that he could depend on the members of both Houses of Parliament, and on the Council, for reasons already given, determined to introduce without delay the "Reformation" in all its completeness into England. Ignoring altogether the spiritual authority of the hierarchy, the Council easily induced the boy King to follow the example set by his royal father in 1536 by issuing on his own responsibility certain "religious injunctions." These, together with a "New Book of Homilies" composed by Cranmer, and a "Paraphrase of the New Testament" by Erasmus, were ordered to be placed in every church in the kingdom by commissioners—a mixed body of laymen and clerics—who were appointed to make a general visitation with the view to making inquiries into all "ecclesiastical concernments." These commissioners were everywhere accompanied by special preachers, who were deputed to dissuade the people "from invoking saints, praying for the dead, honoring images, using beads, or ashes on Ash Wednesday, taking part in processions or having dirges sung for the dead."

Acting on a special order from the Council, Bonner, Bishop of London, as dean of the bishops, commanded the provincial prelates to abstain from preaching or making visitations whilst the commissioners were on circuit. All preachers except those specially licensed by the Council were silenced. This, Collier candidly admits, was done "to hinder those who opposed the intended Reformation from spreading their opinions and haranguing where they pleased. Whereas those of the Protestant sentiment might move at large, have the countenance of a royal authority and make as many proselytes as they were able" (vol. v., p. 194). Detecting clear evidences of Germanic Protestantism in the homilies and injunctions spread broadcast throughout England, Bonner, Bishop of London; Tunstal, of Durham, and Gardiner, of Winchester, openly protested against the religious changes, which, even without the formality of Episcopal sanction and against the will of the Lord Chancellor Wriothesley, had been imposed on the nation. Bonner, notwithstanding the humiliating retraction which he had speedily made, was imprisoned in the Fleet; Tunstal soon discovered that his place in the Council was filled by another; Gardiner, on account of his great popularity, was spared for a time, but the Lord Chancellor was at once called upon to resign the Great Seal of his high office.

Protestants, both at home and abroad, openly rejoiced at the repeal in the first year of this reign of all the statues against

heretics passed during the reigns of Richard II., Henry IV. and Henry VIII.

In the same session of Parliament an act was p.ssed ordaining "that the most Blessed Sacrament should be hereafter commonly delivered and ministered unto the people within the Church of England and Ireland and other of the King's dominions under both kinds, that is to say, of bread and wine." The King was authorized to provide a suitable form, and this task he entrusted not to a convocation of the hierarchy, but to a selected number of bishops and divines whose names will be afterwards given.

The last act in this winter session (December, 1537) was specially calculated, as Heylyn admits, "to weaken the authority of the Episcopal order, by forcing them from their stronghold of divine institution and making them no other than King's Ministers only, his ecclesiastical sheriffs, as a man might say, to execute his will and dispense his mandates" (Edward VI., p. 51). In this statute, entitled "An Act for the Election of Bishops," it was ordered that bishops in future should be appointed by the King's Letters Patent, and not, as of old, by the election of deans and chapters.

Having completely shelved the bishops, the Council proceeded to further reforms by commanding Bonner to send a circular letter to all the suffragan bishops, requiring them to cease from the use of the ancient ceremonies customary on Candlemas Day, Ash Wednesday and Palm Sunday. Bonner's letter speaks for itself:

MY DEAR GOOD LORD: After my most hearty congratulations, this is to advertise your Lordship that my Lord of Canterbury this 28th day of January (1538) sent unto me these letters missive, containing this to effect, that my Lord Protector's Grace, with advice of other of the King's Majesty's Honourable Privy Council (for certain considerations them moving), are fully resolved that no candles shall be borne on Candlemas Day; nor else, from henceforth Ashes, and Palms used any longer, requiring me thereupon, by the said letters, to cause admonition and knowledge thereof to be given to your Lordship and the other bishops with celerity accordingly. In consideration, I do send at this present these said letters to your Lordship, that you may thereupon give knowledge and advertisement thereof within your Diocese as appertaineth.

Thus committing your good Lordship to Almighty, to as well to fare as your heart can desire,

EDMUND, London.

A further proof of the contempt with which the Council regarded both the spiritual authority of the bishops and the religious connections of the nation is contained in a second order addressed by the Council to the Bishop of London. This second mandate of the Council to Bonner, which runs as follows, well displays the methods employed to force the Reformation on an unwilling clergy and people:

After our right hearty commendations to your good Lordship, where now of late, in the King's Majesty's visitations, amongst other goodly injunctions commanded generally to be observed through all parts of His Majesty's realm one was set forth for the taking down of such images, as had at any time been abused, Pilgrimages, offerings, or censes; albeit this said Injunction hath, in many parts of the realm been quietly obeyed and executed; yet, in many other places much

strife and contention hath arisen, and daily riseth, and more and more increaseth about the execution of the same; some men being so superstitious, or rather wilful, as they would by their good wills, retain all such images still, though they have been most manifestly abused; and almost, in every place, is contention for images, whether they have been abused or not. And whilst these men go on both sides continuously contentiously to obtain their minds; contending whether this image or that image hath been offered unto, kissed, censed, or otherwise abused; parts have been taken in some places, in such sort, as further inconveniences be like to ensue, if remedy be not found in time. Considering therefore that in almost no place of this realm is any sure quietness, but where all images be clean taken away and pulled down already, to the intent that all contention in every part of this realm, for this matter, be clearly taken away; and the lively image of Christ should not contend with dead images, which be things not necessary, and without which the Churches of Christ continued most godly many years. We have thought good to signify unto you, that His Highness's pleasure with the advice and consent of Us, the Lord Protector and the rest of the Council, is, that immediately upon sight hereof, with as convenient diligence as you may, you shall not only give order that all the images remaining in any church or chapel within your Diocese be removed and taken away, but also, by your letters, signify unto the rest of the Bishops within your Province this, His Highness's pleasure, for the like order to be given to them and every one of them within their several Dioceses. And, in the execution hereof we require both you and the rest of the said bishops to use such foresight that the same may be quietly done, with as good satisfaction to the people as may be.

Your Lordship's loving friends,

EDWARD SOMERSET, ANTHONY WINGFIELD, THOMAS SEYMOUR,
HENRY ARUNDEL, JOHN RUSSELL, WILLIAM PAGET.

Somerset Place, February 11, 1548.

Without consulting the wishes of the bishops, and in spite of the violent protests of an indignant people, the Council had thus in a very short time made a considerable advance in the work of "reforming" the country. The Lord Protector and his followers and not the King, a boy aged 10, must be held accountable for Cranmer's Homilies, the Paraphrase of Erasmus and the "Injunctions" which aimed a death blow at many a Catholic doctrine. By them the ancient ceremonies usual on Candlemas Day, Ash Wednesday and Palm Sunday were suppressed and made illegal in the Church of England.

Constantine the Great had ordered that crucifixes should be erected throughout the Roman Empire (Eusebius, Vita Constantini, Lib. I). But the new Christians of the Reformation were of another way of thinking, and, by order of the Protector and Council, all crucifixes and sacred images were removed from the churches.

Heylyn shrewdly observes "that covetousness more than religious zeal prompted the last act, there being none of the images so poor the spoil whereof would not afford them (the courtiers) some gold and silver, if not jewels also, besides censers, candlesticks and other rich utensils appertaining to them. In this respect the commissioners hitherto authorized were received in many places with scorn and railing, and the further they went from London, the worse they were handled" (Heylyn, p. 56).

While the Council was thus effacing every aspect of Catholicity from the Church in England, no protest against these acts of desecration was raised by the bishops. Indeed, as the bishops well knew,

any protest they might make must remain ineffectual. Their exalted position was no longer recognized. The Act for the election of bishops had reduced them to the condition of mere servants of the State, and Cranmer, the most prominent man amongst them, had openly proclaimed his dependence on the Crown by seeking a reinvestiture of his spiritual jurisdiction at the hands of the present monarch on his accession to the throne. The dependence of the bishops in spiritual matters on the secular authority is indeed the point insisted upon in the two "Injunctions."

The first injunction was to the effect "that they, the bishops, should, to the utmost of their power, wit and understanding, see and cause all and singular the King's injunctions heretofore given, or hereafter to be given from time to time in and through their diocese, duly, faithfully to be kept, observed and accomplished, etc.," while the second injunction received was "that they should not at any time preach or set forth unto the people any doctrine repugnant to that effect and intent contained or set forth unto the people in the King's Highness' homilies; neither yet should they admit or give license to preach to any within their diocese, but to such as they should know (or at least assuredly trust) would do the same" (Heylyn, p. 37). Parliament during this year (1548) reënacted a statute passed in the twenty-seventh year of Henry VIII., but till now never enforced, by which all chantries or foundations for daily Masses for deceased persons, obits or foundations for anniversary Masses for deceased persons, free chapels, colleges and hospitals, with all their endowments, were placed at the disposal of the King.

These, together with the lands belonging to various guilds and endowments left for church lights, became now the booty of the courtiers. The chantries and obits were suppressed on the pretext that they rested on a basis of superstition, inasmuch as they supposed the existence of purgatory and the efficacy of prayers for the departed (Heylyn, p. 51). But no matter what the pretext, it was clear that the end was plunder. Even such a favorer of the new order as Latimer freely admitted that the followers of Somerset had a greater desire for the goods than the good of the Church. Preaching in the royal presence during Lent (1548) at St. Paul's Cross, he bitterly complained "that the holy revenues of the Church were seized by the rich laity; that the incumbent was only a proprietor in title; that chantry priests were presented to several cures, to excuse the patrons from paying their pensions; that many benefices were let out in fee farms by secular men, or else given to their servants as a consideration for keeping their hounds, hawks and horses, and, lastly, that the poor clergy were reduced to such short allowances that they were forced to go to service" (Collier, vol. v., p. 244).

The next step taken in the onward march of the Reformation was the assembling of a selected number of bishops and learned divines at Windsor in compliance with the King's command to devise a method for carrying out the Act of Parliament recently passed for "Administering Holy Communion in the English tongue, and under both kinds of bread and wine."

The following bishops and divines formed the commission: Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury; Holgate, Bishop of York; Bonner, of London; Tunstal, of Durham; Heath, of Worcester; Reps, of Norwich; Parfue, of St. Asaphs; Salcot, of Salisbury; Sampson, of Coventry and Lichfield; Aldrick, of Carlisle; Ferrars, of St. Davids; Gooderich, of Ely; Holbeach, of Lincoln; Day, of Chichester; Skyp, of Hereford; Thirlby, of Westminster; Ridley, of Rochester; Doctor Cox, dean of Christchurch; Doctor May, dean of St. Paul's; Doctor Taylor, dean of Lincoln; Doctor Heynes, dean of Exeter; Doctor Robertson, dean of Durham, and Doctor Redmayne, master of Trinity College, Cambridge.

Before drawing up the Form for Communion under both kinds some interesting discussions on several points of Catholic doctrine took place which are of interest as illustrating the different religious views of the members of the Commission. Only the subjects which have a special interest will be referred to here. With very little variation and some necessary explanation, Collier's account of what took place during the discussion will be given. The different interchange of views was clearly brought out by the question proposed.

Question III. What is the oblation and the Sacrifice of Christ in the Mass?

Cranmer, Ridley, Ferrars and Holbeach adopted the following definition: "The oblation and Sacrifice of Christ in the Mass is not so called because Christ indeed is there offered and sacrificed by the priest and the people (for that was done but once by Himself on the cross), but it is so called because it is a memory and representation of that very true sacrifice and immolation which before was made upon the cross."

Drs. Cox and Taylor would have it that "the oblation in the Eucharist was nothing more than prayer, thanksgiving and the remembrance of our Saviour's Passion." Holgate, Heath, Reps, Parfue, Tunstal, Salcot, Gooderich, Sampson, Day and Skyp adopted a far more Catholic definition, which was: "The oblation and Sacrifice of Christ in the Mass is the presenting of the very body and blood of Christ to God the Father under the form of bread and wine; that these Eucharistic elements are consecrated with prayer and thanksgiving, for the Universal Church, and in remembrance of our Saviour's Passion."

Aldrich, Bishop of Carlisle, insisted on giving a more striking definition of his own: "The oblation and Sacrifice in the Mass," he insisted, "is even the same which was offered by Christ on the cross, ever and everywhere abiding and enduring of like strength, virtue and power. The difference is that on the cross, Christ being priest and sacrifice, offered Himself visibly, and in the Mass, being likewise both priest and sacrifice, offers Himself invisibly by the common minister of the Church, who, in the name and stead of the whole congregation, offers and presents as he is commanded by Christ."

Whatever may be thought of the respective merits of the two last definitions, it must be admitted that they are framed in a more Catholic spirit than the first and second, both of which savor strongly of Calvinism. It is evident from the discussion itself that eleven bishops on the committee believed that in the Mass "the very body and blood of Christ" are presented "to God the Father." Only four bishops, viz.: Cranmer, Ridley, Holbeach and Ferrars, denied the reality of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

The next question is of great interest as illustrating the bishops' faith in Masses and prayers for the dead:

Question VII. Whether it is convenient that satisfactory Masses should continue, and priests hired to sing Masses for souls departed?

Cranmer, Ridley and Holbeach think "it not convenient that satisfactory Masses should continue." Bonner, Skyp, Heath, Reps, Day and Parfue all believe "that the priest in praying in the Mass for the quick and the dead, and officiating in other circumstances of the Sacrament, may receive maintenance on that score." Tunstal, of Durham, held "that all priests were bound to say Mass for the living and the dead, though they are not acting under any agreement for that purpose." He nevertheless maintains that the people are bound to support the priest. Gooderich, of Ely, held "that praying for the dead is a commendable primitive and uninterrupted custom, and seems to have some ground in Scripture, and further he appealed to the testimony of St. Ambrose, St. Chrysostom and others. But to say Mass for money by way of commerce and exchange, as if there were a just proportion between the money, between the performance and the reward, managing thus, as it were, by way of articles, looks, he thinks, like simoniacal covetousness; and yet, all this must be understood with a due reserve for those texts of Scripture where the "laborer" is said to be "worthy of his hire" and "the Lord hath ordained that they who preach the gospel should live by the gospel."

Aldrich, of Carlisle, declared "that if anything or any action of the priest is interpreted to be a full satisfaction for sins, venial or mortal, there is no authority in proof of such an assertion, and he professes

himself unwilling to admit that priests are hired, by way of bargain, to offer up Masses for departed souls. He would rather put it that praying for the living and the dead is part of the church service; that it is performed by the priest as part of his duty, without any regard to pecuniary advantage. However, he holds that the clergy ought to be considered for their administration. Then, as to perfect and plenary indulgence for sins, that is only to be attributed to our Saviour's Passion. At the same time, those who go out of this world charged only with venial sins unrepented, may be relieved by the Eucharistic Sacrifice and the prayers of the Church, and for this he cited St. Augustine, St. Jerome, "Pro non valde malis propitiationes fiant, et de levioribus peccatis, cum quibus obligati, defuncti sunt, possunt post mortem absolvi."

In summing up this controversy it will be seen that Cranmer, Ridley and Holbeach adopt the Protestant view as to the value of satisfactory Masses. Bonner, Tunstal, Skyp, Heath, Reps, Day, Parfue, Gooderich and Aldrich, whilst condemning simony, as all Catholics do, are agreed as to benefits to be derived from Masses for the dead. If we add the name of Ferrars, who has not spoken, to the partisans of Cranmer, the result is four bishops are against satisfactory Masses and nine believe in their efficacy.

Question IX. Whether in the Mass it is convenient to use such language as the people understand?

Cranmer, Holgate, Holbeach, Gooderich, Ridley and Aldrich voted in favor of the vernacular. Bonner, Heath, Skyp, Day, Reps, Parfue, Tunstal and Bush were unfavorable to any change, and wished to retain the Latin language.

Question. When did the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament, and the "hanging up" of the same first begin?

Cranmer and Holbeach were both of opinion that reservation began six or seven hundred years after Christ, and "hanging up" at a later period.

It may be worth while to show how absolutely without foundation was the opinion of Cranmer and Holbeach. The question of "reservation" is indeed one of pressing interest. The recent decision of the Anglican bishops that "reservation," though primitive, is illegal, will be fresh in the minds of our readers. Tertullian (born about 160 and died about 230) narrates that the Blessed Sacrament was reserved in the houses of faithful Christians who were permitted to communicate themselves at home during the time of persecution.

He thus addresses the Christian wife: "Will your husband know what it is you secretly taste before any food; and if he knew it to be bread, does he not believe it to be that (bread) which it is said to be?" (Ad Uxorem Lib. ii., c. 5.)

St. Jerome, arguing against Iovinian, asserts that "the faithful, even the married, communicated daily, and that when they did not think themselves in a condition to enter the church, still they did not fail to receive the Body of Christ at home." (Fleury's Ecclesiastical History, A. D. 381-400. Parker's translation, Oxford, 1842. Vol. I., p. 175.)

Dionysius, of Alexandria, in his account of Serapion's death, makes it clear that reservation of the Blessed Sacrament either in the church or at the presbytery was common A. D. 249. "I will give you an example of what occurred to us," writes Dionysius. "There was a certain Serapion, an aged believer, who had passed his life irreproachably, but as he had sacrificed during the persecution, though he frequently begged, no one would listen to him. He was taken sick and continued three days speechless and senseless. On the fourth day, recovering a little, he called his grandchild to him and said: 'O son, how long do you detain me; I beseech you, hasten and quickly absolve me. Call one of the presbyters to me.' Saying this, he again became speechless. The boy ran to the presbyter. But it was night, and the presbyter was sick. As he had, however, before issued an injunction that those at the point of death, if they desired it, and especially if they entreated for it before, should receive absolution that they might depart from life in comfortable hope, I gave the boy a small portion of the Eucharist, telling him to dip it in water and drop it into the mouth of the old man. The boy returned with the morsel. When he came near, before he entered, Serapion, having again recovered himself, said: 'Thou art come, my son, but the presbyter could not come; but do thou quickly what thou art commanded, and dismiss me.' The boy moistened it, and at the same time dropped it into the old man's mouth. And he, having swallowed a little, immediately expired." (Eusebius Lib. VI., cap. 44.)

The thirteenth canon of the Council of Nice, A. D. 325, places the matter beyond doubt. It is headed:

"De Extremis Laborantibus.

"De iis qui ad exitum veniunt, etiam nunc lex antiqua, regularisque servabitur, ita ut si quis egreditur de corpore, ultimo et necessario viatico minime privetur (summa Conciliorum, Louis Bail, Paris, 1659)."

When a Council, held A. D. 325, declares the custom of giving the Holy Viaticum to the sick to be the ancient and regular practice, that custom must go back to Apostolic times.

The ancient and constant practice mentioned in the Council of Nice necessarily presupposes the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament, for it would be impossible to carry out the decree unless the

sacred species were reserved, either at the church or in the presbytery. Mortal illness may attack one at any hour, but it was the general rule, at that early date, to offer up the great sacrifice in the morning for reasons which Saint Cyprian sets forth (Epistle 62, Sec. 7) "because the Passion of our Lord," which took place in the morning, "is the main of our Sacrifice."

If the act passed in Parliament during the first year of King Edward's reign be closely examined it is seen to imply that reservation of the Blessed Sacrament was general. It states that communion under both kinds should be "commonly delivered and ministered in the church if necessity does not otherwise require," as "in the cases of sudden sickness" and "other such like extremities." It was lawful, therefore, according to this act, to reserve the Holy Eucharist under the form of bread, that people taken suddenly ill might not depart this life without the Holy Viaticum. The bishops and divines assembled in a committee at Windsor advised in their report that the whole Office of the Mass to the end of the Canon should be recited as heretofore in the Latin language, but suggesting that before the Communion an exhortation should be delivered in English to the communicants, followed by the invitation: "You that do truly and earnestly repent of your sins, etc.," and proceeding to the general confession, the absolution, the comfortable sentences of Sacred Scriptures, and so unto the prayer of humble address, "We do not presume to come to this table, etc."

The Blessed Eucharist was then to be given under both kinds; first to the clergy, afterwards to the people, the celebrant saying: "The body of our Lord, that was given for thee, preserve thy soul unto everlasting life. The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thy soul unto everlasting life." The congregation were to receive the consecrated elements reverently kneeling, after which they were to receive the priest's blessing.

By order of the Council the obligation of making a sacramental confession before Communion was abolished, and the priest in his instructions to the people before receiving the Blessed Eucharist, was commanded to tell those who made the customary confession before not to censure those who considered confession to God alone sufficient. All who still clung to the faith of their fathers bitterly resented this action of the Council, which formally denied the necessity of auricular confession.

The book containing the new order of Mass was first commanded to be observed by royal proclamation and afterwards Archbishop Cranmer, in a circular letter dated March 15, 1548, enjoined on the bishops the obligation of giving a copy of the new Missal to every vicar and curate in their several dioceses.

Somerset and his followers, having made confession a matter of option in the Church of England, commenced an attack on the Eucharistic Sacrifice and on the Real Presence of our Lord in the Eucharist. This was clearly foreshadowed in their treatment of Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester. Fully realizing that the most influential of their Episcopal opponents must be either made to conform to the new order of religious worship in the Church, or effectually silenced, they liberated Gardiner from prison, commanding him at the same time to prepare a sermon to be preached at St. Paul's Cross, in which he should openly declare his acceptance of the latest reforms, and carefully avoid all reference to the Sacrament of the Eucharist and the Sacrifice of the Mass.

When the bishop entered the pulpit in the presence of the King and Council, he took for his text Matthew xvi., 16, "Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God."

In the beginning he expressed himself very fully on the Pope's supremacy; he commended the dissolution of monasteries and chantries; he approved of the King's proceedings; he thought that images might have been offensively used, and that removing them was therefore justifiable enough. He approved the receiving of the Sacrament in both kinds, by the laity, and the abolishing of great numbers of satisfactory Masses, and was well pleased with the new order of Holy Communion. But he maintained the Real Presence in strong language, declaring that "the very same body and blood of Christ was present in the Sacrament to feed us that was given to redeem us." (Collier, Vol. V., p. 276.)

As Gardiner accepted all the other reforms, his only offense on this occasion was his maintaining an article of faith not as yet condemned, namely, the Real Presence of our Lord in the Holy Eucharist. Immediately after his sermon, however, the bishop was sent back a prisoner to the Tower of London, where he remained until the accession of Queen Mary to the throne. Yet the "punishment of this great prelate," as Heylyn observes (p. 63) "did not so much discourage those of the Romish party as his example animated them and emboldened them to inconformity, as gave no small disturbance to the King's proceedings."

The uniform order for administering Communion under both kinds had a very hostile reception throughout the country, exasperated, doubtlessly, by the illegal proceedings of the Council in abolishing auricular confession and in imprisoning Gardiner. Many of the secular priests, as well as members of the higher clergy attached to Cathedrals and other churches, united together in obstructing the Council's proceedings and in treating its orders with open contempt. Many of the licensed preachers, too, increased the re-

ligious anarchy by combining with the unlicensed in denouncing the Council for subverting the Catholic faith. But those of the clergy who were favorable to the Reformation showed their partiality for the new doctrines by sacrilegiously treating the Blessed Sacrament. Instances of this sacrilegious treatment are recorded in the Register Book in Petworth parish.

The King and Lords of the Council, aware of the gravity of the situation and determined to boldly face it, decided that a new Liturgy should be drawn up and confirmed by Parliament. Penalties were to be inflicted on all who should disobey its rules and instructions.

The history of the compilation of the First Book of Common Prayer has been fully treated in *The American Catholic Quarterly Review* for April, 1901.

WILLIAM FLEMING.

London.

DETERMINISM VERSUS FREE-WILL.

OF the numberless charges brought by modern science against the philosophical views of the past ages none are perhaps more strange than those which bear upon human freedom. The new philosophy, on the one hand, whilst it glories in having restored man to full liberty in social, political and religious life, accuses the old school of having ministered to oppression and tyranny by shattering the very foundation of individual rights. Denying, on the other hand, the very possibility of self-determination and subjecting all volition to inevitable necessity, it condemns the thinkers of former times for granting to the human will the power of choosing. Yet, strange as these imputations are, they are nowadays universally concurred in, and to such a degree that outside of the schools which espouse the scholastic system of philosophy free-will is nearly everywhere disclaimed as an obsolete and absurd assumption, just as ancient polities are abhorred as forms of absolutism. Whence, we may well ask, is this novel view denying the freedom of our will? Who are they that broached it first? And on what philosophical basis does it rest to win such general assent? Again, what discrepancy has been discovered in the old free-will theory to bring it into disfavor with our century of light and progress?

I.

True, there were adversaries of free-will also in former ages; but their number was then comparatively small, and their theories ever failed of a wide acceptance. There were, as once in ancient Greece,

the fatalists, who held that the entire universe, men and even the deity included, were ruled by blind necessity. There were the pantheists, who regarded the world with all its parts as evolved from the absolute, either by a physical or an intellectual process. But views like these, being either too abstruse or too plainly contradictory to common sense, never won the popular mind. Then came the reformers of the sixteenth century, especially Luther and Calvin, who, adjudging the human will to have been wounded in its very nature by original sin and utterly disabled for virtue, made the denial of its freedom an article of their new creed. In their mind, moreover, God, the first Cause and Supreme Ruler, so swayed and predetermined His creatures, rational as well as irrational, as to leave no room to them for self-determination. But their teaching was sectarian only and in the course of time re-reformed or even renounced by their followers.

The real basis of modern theories hostile to free-will is the materialistic view, according to which there is no difference in kind between mind and body, between thought and the vibrations of atoms and molecules, between the laws that govern the psychic activities and those which are obeyed by physical phenomena. However, materialism, espoused and commented on as it was by diverse philosophers, assumed many phases. Formerly it was developed from its own principles, but in our day it is combined with other philosophical systems and shaped in many respects to their tenets. The offspring of its union with pantheism is monism. According to this system matter is the one first and universal cause, from which all things, of whatever nature they may be, take their origin in continuous and progressive evolution; wherefore matter is supposed to be continually changing from all eternity, yet independent of any extrinsic cause; indeterminate, yet at the same time self-determining; imperfect and inert, yet the source of all perfection and activity. To their mind a personal God, distinct from the world, is allegedly inconceivable; hence they give to matter the attributes and the throne of the deity. Herbert Spencer pretends to lay a deeper foundation for monism. For, going beyond matter, he considers the Unknowable as the first and universal cause of which all forces and matter itself, being but a combination of forces, are necessary manifestations, and the entire world, physical, intellectual and social, is a regular and continuous evolution. Spencerian philosophy, which is closely allied to German pantheism, may seem to rise above the common level of materialism, since it ventures to identify matter and spirit in a higher plane, which is neither material nor spiritual. But, as closer examination shows, Mr. Spencer knows no other ultimate forces than those of attraction and repulsion peculiar to matter,

and assigns as the ultimate cause of the universe an unknowable power, which is nothing but an abstraction, the common element found in all forces and phenomena.

Attempts have also been made both by him and by other authors to wed materialism to idealism, and empiricism to Kantian rationalism. As the materialistic idealists put it, we perceive only phenomena. Whatever is beyond them is unknowable; if it be conceived in thought, it is a fiction of the mind, proved by critical analysis to be intrinsically contradictory. Hence substance, essence, cause, and likewise the principles based on them, are fictitious and unreal conceptions. Phenomena, however, are not realities existing outside of us, but only appearances in our mind, states of our consciousness connected in uninterrupted sequence. One part of them is simple and vivid, and these are taken for the outer or objective world; the other part is faint and compound, reduced to groups and orders by our own mental operation, and these constitute the inner or subjective world. The activity by which we perceive the simple and vivid phenomena, which are the elements of all knowledge, is sensuous; the activity by which we reduce them to order and thus create science is intellectual. But though thus idealized, the theory is still merged in materialism. For both activities, the intellectual as well as the sensuous, are essentially organic, the latter being the function of the external organs of sense, the former of the brain, the internal organ of the subtler and productive faculties of imagination, memory and association. And again all organic power of perception and feeling is in reality not distinct from the forces of matter. Or, in the words of materialistic authors, *mind and body are not two distinct realities, but two aspects, phases or sides of one and the same thing.* The mind with the psychic phenomena of perception and feeling, of experience and science, is the subjective; the body with the physical phenomena of attraction, of heat and of electricity is the objective aspect. Such identity of mind and body is affirmed like a fundamental dogma on account of the intimate relationship existing between them. It is nevertheless maintained that between body and mind there is a difference transcending all differences, and that psychic and physical phenomena, running in two parallel lines, have nothing in common and cannot be resolved into one another.[1]

Modern philosophy embodying these views is extolled as the climax of mental culture and wisdom, as the only true science, opposition to which is ignorance and superstition, as the light and glory of the age, and the final result of evolution slowly progressing through the preceding centuries.

[1] Cf. M. Maher, S. J., "Psychology," Stonyhurst Series, fourth edition, pp. 505-525; C. Gutberlet, "Der Kampf um die Seele," pp. 143-201. Mainz. Kirchheim, 1899.

From materialistic tenets alloyed with idealistic and evolutionary views a theory of human volition is deduced which gives the death-blow to free-will. The regularity to which the process of evolution is subject implies that all phenomena follow one another in unbroken and invariable succession, in so much that every event is uniformly preceded by another, and every subsequent event is inevitably determined by the one preceding. The very succession of the phenomena is conceived as causation or determination by an antecedent; for our cognition reaches only sequence, not internal influence. The uniformity of succession objectively constitutes law and order, but subjectively generates in our mind the idea of necessity, and is, therefore, tantamount to the principle of causality, meaning that every effect or phenomenon necessarily requires a cause. These are the first scientific principles based on experience, holding true both of physical and of psychic phenomena, though with the implication that a psychic event is determined only by a psychic, and a physical event only by a physical antecedent. The antecedent of a volition is in part the character of the agent, in part the motive rendering the action desirable. The character consists in dispositions and propensities intrinsic to the agent's organism and is either inherited from ancestors or formed by past actions. The motives arise from the pleasurableness or impleasurableness of the action and its object, or from the influence exercised by the environment. Character and motives determine the acts of the will with the same inevitable necessity with which one body moves another by its impulse, and with the same uniformity with which day follows night or spring follows winter. If we, therefore, could know a man's character and motives under given circumstances, we might with as much exactness foresee his conduct as astronomers foretell an eclipse of the sun to take place years afterward. But science is not yet so far advanced as to give us a perfect insight into character or certain knowledge of all influences, present and future, to be exercised by surroundings on any individual man.

In consistency with such assertions freedom of will is inconceivable. A free action proceeds from the self-determination of the agent. It is, therefore, not within the series of succeeding phenomena in nature, not inevitably determined by an antecedent, and, therefore, it is, without a cause and sufficient reason, a break in the uniformity of the universe, an exemption from law and order, a thing which science cannot reach nor the mind represent in thought. In a word, a free action or volition is a contradiction to the principle of causation, an impossibility. Accordingly, if consciousness is appealed to as a witness for its existence, its testimony is to be rejected as *a priori* false and deceptive, as so many perceptions f the senses are.

Thus free-will is unanimously arraigned by modern science, and, it would seem, stands condemned by the common opinion of the enlightened portion of mankind.

II.

But is its case in reality lost, its defense impossible? Before entering on any discussion it will be proper to analyze the conception of free-will and so to arrive at a clear and exact definition. In a broad sense freedom of will is the capability of self-determination; the determinists also conceive it thus. But again, what is implied in such capability? Let us contrast a necessary with a self-determining faculty. A necessary faculty is so constituted that when all prerequisites for operation, both extrinsic and intrinsic, are present, it cannot but put forth the action. The prerequisites, therefore, not only make it a complete and adequate cause, but also inevitably determine it, so as to leave no possibility for it to abstain from action. Faculties of this kind are, undoubtedly, our understanding, our senses and our vegetative powers. A self-determining faculty, on the contrary, is constituted by the prerequisites a complete cause fully enabled to operate, but is not determined by them, so that in their very presence it may put forth and may withhold the action. It is, therefore, left in a state of indifference with regard to operation, an indifference, however, which is not passive, consisting in the susceptibility for further influences that may stimulate and determine it, but active, implying the power of determining on either alternative, either action or its omission. For such power must necessarily be conceived to be inherent in an agent that is fully able to elicit an action and also to withhold it; were it absent, the agent would be involved in the sheer impossibility to act. It is in this sense only that capability of self-determination must be understood. Consequently the freedom of the will is correctly defined as an endowment, by virtue of which the will, when all conditions prerequisite to elicit a volition are present, is enabled either to put forth or to abstain from that volition.[2] The same idea is expressed by St. Thomas[3] and the ancient school in general, when they define freedom as the mastery which the will has over its acts, because it is able to elicit or to abstain from them.

Now, is there any incongruity in the idea of free-will so defined, or is there any intrinsic contradiction in the conception of a cause or faculty which, when all conditions prerequisite for action are fulfilled, is able to act and also to abstain from acting? Where is

---

[2] Cf. M. Maher, "Psychology," p. 395. [3] Summa c. gent. lib. I., cp. 68; S. th., P. I., qu. 82, art. 1, ad. 3.

the possibility of a contradiction, or of what nature should it be? A contradiction would be involved if freedom were to mean the presence and at the same time the absence also of a power to produce an effect, or the capability of simultaneonsly acting and not acting. But neither is meant. Freedom implies the capability of acting and the capability of abstaining from action, both capabilities simultaneously existing in the same faculty, but not simultaneously exercisable.

Nor is a free action an effect without a cause or a negation of the principle of causation, of law, order and uniformity. There is, indeed, a cause, and a fully sufficient cause of an action freely elicited. It is the will itself taken together with all the prerequisites of action. The prerequisites comprise among other things the knowledge of the act to be put forth and its object, its goodness or its badness, its advantages and disadvantages, all which constitute the motive of volition; they comprise also the inclination, disposition and energy of the will-power necessary for a given exertion. Free-will is in the presence of such prerequisites as sufficient a cause of the action which it performs as the necessary agent is of the effect it produces; nay, free-will is a cause incomparably more perfect, being able to act by its own determination and having full mastery over its actions.

Nor is it, therefore, necessary to conceive the free action as exempt from law, order and uniformity, and on that account inconsistent with the principle of causality. Free-will, though it acts by its own determination, does not and cannot determine itself but in accordance with its own nature. Its actions, therefore, are subject to the laws of rational nature, which are in part physical, in part moral, and conforming to them they make up the grandest and sublimest order, infinitely more attractive than all the beauties of the material universe. Besides, there is no impossibility in the fact that the will, though acting free and unconstrained, determines itself uniformly. In reality by uniform action habits and character are formed, and these once confirmed, uniformity consistent with self-determination increases. Several free agents may also follow the same line of conduct, acting in a similar manner under similar circumstances. For men, quite conformably with their nature, usually do not take to such actions as cannot be performed but with difficulty and extraordinary exertion, and, *vice versa*, do not abstain from such as are highly agreeable or advantageous either for the moment or the near future. Under these conditions, therefore, there will arise uniformity also in human conduct. It will, however, never be perfect, since there will always be numerous exceptions. Nor will it exclude self-determination; for also when the difficulty, or, on the contrary, the pleasurableness, of an action is unusually

great, we still are fully conscious that we could make greater efforts and, by making them, renounce an enticing pleasure or endure a very disagreeable hardship.

But even if free actions had no uniformity whatever, they would not on that account be contradictory to the principle of causality. Causation and succession are not identical, as materialistic philosophers maintain. The former implies a positive influence of the antecedent on the consequent, the latter does not. There is causation where there is no succession, as was the case when the first effect was produced; and there is succession where there is no causation, as between day and night. Nor does the principle of causality coincide with uniformity of succession. The necessity of causation is implied in the very nature of a finite being, or a thing that comes into existence out of non-existence, and, therefore, transcends all experience. It is an absolutely necessary truth known *a priori*, so universal as to hold true of all events and phenomena taken singly and collectively, whether succeeding one another or standing apart. The uniformity of phenomena, on the contrary, is a contingent fact, changeable and reversible, proved inductively from experience and hence admissible so far only as our experimental knowledge reaches in every particular province of nature. Consequently it is an utter confusion of thought to assert that the absence of uniformity in succession is the subversion of the principle of causality, which means that every effect must have its sufficient cause.

Since, then, none of the objections raised against the possibility of a free, self-determining faculty is tenable, none of the contradictions which materialists have tried to point out in it is real and none can be shown to be intrinsic to it, its conception must be regarded as logically sound and consistent.

III.

This being established as a certain truth, the question follows, whether in fact the will is or is not endowed with the capability of self-determination. The proofs advanced for and against are in part *a priori*, that is, taken from previously adopted theories, in part *a posteriori*, that is, derived from experience either directly or indirectly.

As *a priori* reasons the determinists advance the supremacy of matter, the indeterminists, as the defenders of freedom are called, the spirituality of the soul. It must undoubtedly be granted that, on the ground of materialistic positions, the freedom of the will cannot stand. Matter, whether organic or inorganic, cannot act but

with necessity and according to necessary laws. A stone does not fall by self-determination, a hungry beast cannot but desire and grasp the food presented to it. If, as the monistic and agnostic theories hold, each psychic phenomenon is inevitably predetermined by its antecedent, and all follow one another in unchangeable uniformity; if the mind is one and the same thing with the body and matter the source of all forces: then, indeed, there is no will-power which, left undetermined by character and motives, acts by self-determination, or remains indifferent as to operation, when all prerequisites are present. It were folly to hold the freedom of will on materialistic premises; it were futile to attempt the arraignment of determinism on the strength of agnostic or monistic principles.

As determinism naturally springs from the supremacy of matter, so the freedom of the will necessarily follows from the spirituality of the soul. That the latter is no mere fiction we shall presently prove. A spirit is a substance neither made of matter nor having the properties of matter, such as extension or inertia, nor intrinsically dependent on matter, or what comes to the same, a spirit is a simple substance elevated above and independent of matter. As the nature of a thing and its activities are always in strict proportion, the cognitive faculty of the spirit, the intellect, apprehends its objects from an immaterial point of view, and hence represents them under the aspect of being. But being comprises all, the existing and the possible, the nature and essence of things as well as their phenomena, causes no less than effects. Thus the spirit is made for knowledge of unlimited extent; it is able to know all things, if not perfectly and directly, at least imperfectly and indirectly, and to know them both in themselves and in their mutual relations, their intrinsic constitution and their actions and appearances, their causes and their principles, proximate and ultimate. It is, moreover, equipped for the performance of manifold operations, for intuition and reasoning, for direct experience of outer things and reflection upon itself. Consequently it perceives not only its own operations, but also its own self as their subject, the *ego*, and not only the existence, but also the nature of the *ego* and the end and goal of its tendencies and aspirations. Recognizing happiness, the possession of the highest good, as such an end, the intellect finds out the object in which it is to be enjoyed and the ways in which it is to be reached. For it apprehends good as such, the very nature of goodness, measures the amount of good that is in all particular things and inquires into the relationship which they bear to the supreme good.

To the unlimited scope of the intellect corresponds the extent of the power of the will. For it stands to reason that whatever nature is endowed with the faculty of knowing good must be supplemented

by the faculty of pursuing it. Therefore the will must be conceived as an inclination to the good as apprehended by the mind. Being such, the will is able to incline to all objects perceived as good, to desire them under that aspect of good, under which they are conceived, and to love them in proportion to the good which they are understood to have. Now the human mind knows all good, finite and infinite, reaches the nature of goodness, and attributes to diverse things a diverse value and degree of goodness. Accordingly, the will also inclines to good as such and is able to desire all good in so much that it cannot rest until it has attained the very fulness of good; yet it pursues its objects with unequal regard and affection. These plain and simple statements borne in mind, it is easily understood that the will desires happiness with irresistible necessity, and all other objects not necessary for happiness, with freedom and indifference. Happiness, which means the possession of all good and immunity from all evil, cannot but be desired by a faculty whose nature consists in the inclination to good as such or to good in general. The mere possibility of the contrary would involve an intrinsic contradiction in the will; because it would mean an innate inclination and at the same time indifference to good, an innate necessity to love good and the simultaneous capability to hate or reject what contains nothing but good, nay, what is goodness itself. Again, the mind, far from representing happiness as an object of indifference, apprehends it by reason of its pure goodness as absolutely desirable, apprehends it as a conditionless necessity and as such that with it the ultimate goal of all objects and desires is reached, but without it no rest and abiding satisfaction is possible.

Objects, on the other hand, which neither cause happiness nor are necessarily connected with its attainment, are of a widely different nature. The good in them is mixed with evil. Hence they are not commensurate with the power of the will, consisting in the inclination to good as such and tending to the fulness of good, and cannot attract it irresistibly. They are such as may move the will and may leave it unmoved, as may move it to love and desire or to hatred and aversion; to love and desire, because they contain some degree of goodness, to hatred and aversion, because they also contain some evil or absence of good. Thus regarding these objects, the will is under no necessity, it has but the mere capability of desiring and of not desiring, of loving and of hating; even when attracted by them, it is not constrained, but enabled only to pursue them, thus remaining in a state of indifference and indeterminateness.

Reason presents such objects to the will also as indifferent to, not necessary of pursuit. Everybody conceives happiness as an object necessarily to be pursued. But things without which happiness can

be obtained, which conduce to it, but are not the sole means that render its attainment possible, are not apprehended as necessary goods, as when many roads lead to a city, none of them in particular is thought to be of indispensable necessity. Goods, therefore, of this kind are represented by the mind as objects which may be desired, because they contribute to happiness, and may not be desired, because happiness can be had without them. To speak in still wider terms, whatever is not good in every regard, or what is not the fulness of good, is conceived by the mind as indifferent to appetition; for what is such is apprehended as desirable for the good that is in it, and as not desirable by reason of the absence of good from it. If the will, then, in accordance with its nature, desires its objects in the manner in which they are known to be desirable, and loves them in proportion to the goodness they are judged to have, it, indeed, pursues happiness with necessity, and, whatever is not necessary for happiness, with indifference.

Nor is this indifference of the will interfered with, when among several goods presented one is preferable to the other. For the greater good, even compared with a lesser, retains its deficiency and imperfection, and the lesser in presence of the greater retains its goodness. Wherefore, as the former, notwithstanding its superiority, may be declined or rejected, so the latter, notwithstanding its inferiority, yet remains worthy of love and desire. Hence both of them leave the will in its indifference.

Careful examination, then, shows that in the will of the spiritual soul there are all attributes necessary to render it free. It is a faculty which at the representation of a good not necessarily connected with happiness is fully able to desire and pursue it, and yet may abstain from its desire and pursuit; a faculty which in the presence of all prerequisites for action, under the influence of its own propensities and habits, and of all external motives and circumstances, may put forth the action of volition or may withhold it; a faculty which is left undetermined and indifferent by its own nature and by the object presented to it, yet, because able to act and to abstain from acting, possesses the power also of determining on either alternative and so is endowed with the capability of self-determination.

If, as we have shown thus far, indeterminism follows from the spirituality of the soul with the same logical necessity as determinism follows from the supremacy of matter, the merits of the two theories depend entirely on the truth or falsehood of the materialistic view. Space does not allow us here to enter upon a critical examination of materialism, nor is it necessary after so many learned essays and most competent works have been written on this subject. On the one hand, the most prominent thinkers of mankind down to our

day, to prove the spirituality of the soul, have advanced not only numerous but also most ingenious and convincing reasons, and reasons which our modern materialists have not yet disproved, nay, not even touched upon, utterly unacquainted as they are with the writings and the thoughts of Christian philosophy. On the other hand, no conclusive proof has thus far been proffered for materialism by its votaries. The boldest of them treat us in their scientific works to hypotheses and conjectures about the nature of psychic processes, while those of deeper learning and greater modesty openly confess their incompetency to explain, how thought can be the function of an organism. It is only an expressed hope that in ages yet to come more advanced science may succeed in satisfactorily proving the identity of mind and body; but even this hope is not entertained by all.[4] The main prop of modern materialism is the impossibility which its adherents profess to experience in conceiving things spiritual and supersensible. Such objects, they tell us, are unthinkable, because on mature reflection our mind discovers nought in them but abstractions, fictions, a conglomerate of intrinsic contradictions.

It is, indeed, astonishing that the ideas of supersensible objects, examined, perfected and developed by the greatest minds of the former ages and made the corner-stone of philosophy and of all moral life, have on a sudden turned out to be inconceivable, an intrinsic absurdity. Were questions involved whose solution depended on scientific researches or close observation by improved instruments, such a sudden change of opinion might be understood. But here we deal with a subject which is grasped only by thought and mental analysis and is at the same time of paramount interest to the human mind in all ages. Wherefore the ancient no less than the modern thinkers were able to grasp them and prompted to inquire into their nature. It is all the more astonishing that materialists brand the spiritual as intrinsically contradictory, notwithstanding all the explanations so often given by the most learned authors, because whilst so doing they are not at all shocked at the flaring contradictions necessarily consequent on the denial of a supramundane Deity and a spiritual soul. For if the personal Deity is done away with, and matter is enthroned in its place, an ultimate and supreme cause is admitted, which is infinite, self-existent, absolutely necessary and eternal, and at the same time finite and changeable in its existence and activity, which is the source of all real perfections, and yet is most imperfect in itself; which is the last foundation of all real things, and yet is only an abstraction and generalization of the mind, the cause of all order, all adaptation to ends, all beauty in the universe, and yet works merely mechanically. If a soul distinct from

[4] Cf. T. Ladd, "Elements of Physiological Psychology," Part III., ch. i., sec. 7-9.

the bodily organism is denied, mind and body are maintained to be one and the self-same real thing, and yet it is asserted that psychic and physical phenomena arising from one and the self-same thing have nothing in common, nay, that there is between mind and body a difference transcending all differences. By the denial of a real metaphysical order, on the ground that there is no cognitive faculty in us to reach it, the objective truth of universal and necessary principles is destroyed, and yet constantly presupposed as a reality in scientific conclusions; the outward world perceived by the senses is converted into subjective phenomena, which have but a deceptive appearance of external objects, and yet they are represented as the only solid reality. All these positions, though manifestly contradictory in themselves, are held by the materialists as primary principles so completely self-evident that denial of them must be stigmatized as utter folly. In truth, they strain out gnats and swallow camels. Their method is to presuppose the theistic doctrine as absurd, nay, as the climax of absurdity, in spite of all reasons advanced for it, to assume in consequence the materialistic view as true and certain, though, far from being corroborated by conclusive proofs, it is condemned by its self-contradictions as thoroughly unreasonable. To sum up, the spirituality of the soul, which is the ultimate origin of free-will, as yet holds its ground, vindicated as it is by irrefragable proofs; the materialistic position, the basis of determinism, not resting on experience and being repugnant to reason, has no claim whatever to truth.

IV.

Still whatever the *a priori* proofs advanced for or against our capability of self-determination be, free-will is asserted as a fact, and facts are proved as conclusive mainly from experience. This is most willingly granted by materialists. Free-will is an internal fact, and must, therefore, be attested by consciousness. Now what do we learn regarding it from internal experience? Two things are beyond all doubt manifested by introspection as a matter of fact: first, that we ourselves guide the course of our thoughts, and, in a special manner, our attention to motives and incitements to action, and secondly, that we ourselves determine what motives are to prevail and to what propensities we are to yield.

Our attention to motives offered is not predetermined. We may take them into consideration, or may direct our thought to some other object. And, if we prefer to deliberate on them, we examine their respective value as we think fit, pondering what is against or in favor of each, or we direct our attention to the one rather than the other, to this aspect of goodness rather than to that. Our attention,

therefore, and reflection are an exercise of free causal energy put forth by ourselves.

When the deliberation is completed we are not yet determined to act or not to act; the decision depends upon ourselves. Daily experience shows that whenever there is a motive for an action on the one hand, and a motive to abstain from it on the other, we have the choice of the alternative, and that, however strongly a habit or a propensity prompts us to pursue or to relinquish a given object, we can resist the inclination. However great the advantages following on a certain line of conduct, and however great the pleasure attending a pursuit in prospect, we are conscious that we can decline the course of action opened to us, because of some evil inseparable from it. Likewise, knowing that some enjoyment or indulgence to which we are prompted is contrary to the dictates of reason, we can and often do renounce it, notwithstanding the repugnance we may feel in obeying the higher law, and notwithstanding the inclination we experience to yield to the lower appetite. If we yield to the stronger impulse, we are fully conscious that we do so under no compulsion, but by our own decision. In all such cases the motives do not inevitably determine us, but we determine ourselves as to what motives we are to follow.

After making a resolve to perform an action, to renounce a pleasure or to overcome a difficulty, we are still conscious that at any moment we can rescind our resolution and follow a different course. Nay, the perseverance necessary in carrying out a resolution requires the greatest effort on our part and frequently entails even a heroic, painful and long struggle. Who will say, then, that it is not the outcome of our own determination, but of acquired habits or momentary impressions and attractions? Thus it is our own will that by its decision starts and directs deliberation on motives, prefers one motive to the other, though oftener the stronger to the weaker, yet sometimes the weaker to the stronger, and in this way chooses the object it is to pursue, the action it is to perform, and, the choice being made, perseveres in the execution of its own resolution struggling with contrary impulses from within and from without.

That such is our consciousness and such the conclusions that must be inferred from its testimony, Professor Sidgwick, though one of the chief defenders of determinism, openly confesses.

"Certainly," says he, "in the case of actions in which I have a distinct consciousness of choosing between alternatives of conduct, one of which I conceive as right and reasonable, I find it impossible not to think that I can now choose to do what I so conceive, however strong may be my inclination to act unreasonably, and however uniformly I may have yielded to such inclination in the past."

That, moreover, such conviction engendered by consciousness is most firm, he very appropriately declares in the following words:

"It is simply impossible for me to think at such a moment that my volition is completely determined by my formed character and motives acting on it. The opposite conviction is so strong as to be absolutely unshaken by the evidence brought against it; I cannot believe it to be illusory. So far it is unlike the erroneous intuitions which occur in the exercise of the senses, as (*e. g.*) the imperfections of sight and hearing. For experience soon teaches me to regard these as appearances whose suggestions are misleading; but no amount of experience of the sway of motives even tends to make me distrust my intuitive consciousness that in resolving after deliberation I exercise free choice as to which of the motives acting on me shall prevail."[5]

If consciousness, then, bears witness to our free choice in numberless cases, are we not in accordance with all the rules of logic entitled to maintain free-will as a matter beyond all doubt? The determinists are at hand with an exception against the conclusion. As to freedom of will, they object, consciousness gives no evidence, because by introspection we know the existence only of our actions, not their causes; nay, it is positively false and deceptive, because, reflecting on ourselves, we confound the ignorance of the motive that determines us with the absence of any determining motive, or take the mere logical possibility of an action for its physical and complete possibility. Yet neither the one nor the other objection is sustained by the reasons alleged. By introspection we know our actions not in general and abstractly, but individually and concretely as they exist in us and proceed from our faculties. But the manner in which a free action proceeds from the will is quite different from that in which a necessary action proceeds from it. Hence we unmistakably can and do discern necessary from free actions, perceiving either the constraint, under which we act, or the absence of it, the necessity which prevents us from acting otherwise or the indifference which renders us capable of acting or not acting. Of all this we are not less distinctly conscious than we are of the difficulty or ease with which we put forth our actions. The other reason advanced against the trustworthiness of our connsciousness is just as untenable. Ignorance of the determinate motive which actually necessitates us and absence of motives which determine us are things so plainly different that it is not possible to mistake the one for the other. Nay, we are most distinctly conscious of active indifference or self-determination just when we have pondered the motives

[5] "Methods of Ethics," Bk. I., c. v., sec. 2, first edition, quoted by M. Maher, "Psychology," p. 367, first edition. On the testimony of consciousness cf. also C. Gutberlet, "Die Willensfreiheit," pp. 30, 237, 256.

present to us and fully understood their full relative value; for it is then that they are perceived as not free from evil and consequently apprehended as not determining us, but as leaving the determination to ourselves. Finally, who in the world has ever after attentive reflection confounded logical with physical possibility, that is, an action merely conceived as possible, with an action really and actually possible under given circumstances? Indeed, when we strongly incline to a pleasure offered or an act of revenge, and a favorable occasion being at hand, yet resist the impulse and abstain from it as unlawful, or when we make the utmost effort to achieve an end, we perceive enjoyment, revenge, rest, freedom from labor and sacrifice not merely absolutely possible, but as easier and more attractive.

There is still another and more serious side to the exception which determinists make to internal experience. According to empiricists, and determinists usually belong to this class of philosophers, consciousness is the criterion of all certainty, because in their opinion the direct and immediate object of our experience and of cognition in general are our subjective affections. In any case consciousness is a necessary condition of certitude, inasmuch as it must reveal, besides the primary fact of our own existence, also the perception of the motive necessary for assent. But if what has been adopted as a criterion of truth or what must be considered as a necessary condition of firm and certain conviction, is, by its very nature, deceptive and unreliable, certitude is impossible and universal skepticism is the necessary consequence. Moreover, if the testimony of consciousness to the existence of free-will is false and deceptive, then a conviction hitherto necessary and unshaken, found among all men and in all ages, is untrue, the reason of its untruth lying in no external illusion, but in the deficiency of human nature. If so, the rational nature of man can no longer be said to have been made for the knowledge of truth; for it would adhere to truth and falsehood with equal firmness and would by its intrinsic constitution and with irresistible force lead men to wrong convictions. Such unfitness for the attaining of truth must be all the more intrinsic to reason, as interior facts, being nearest to the mind and striking it directly, require no special reasoning, but are knowable by intuition. If the mind cannot reach such objects, if apprehending them it errs and produces false perceptions and convictions, what truth is it still able to attain?

Finally, if the will is not free, as our consciousness tells us it is, all opinions ever held by men spring from the human mind with necessity, being as it were the necessary outcome of its nature. But those opinions, whether they be the teachings of philosophers or conclusions arrived at by scientists, are contradictory and utterly irreconcilable; they are, consequently, not all true, but are, in part

at least, false, and many of them are evidently absurd. Rational nature, then, is the necessary source of all errors that ever existed; it constantly contradicts itself and unavoidably leads to absurdities. This conclusion follows with more striking evidence from the evolutionary theory admitted by most determinists. Human reason in the course of its necessary development from stage to stage forms views and convictions which though conducive to the progress of mankind, still prove false in the succeeding higher grades of civilization. Thus in primitive ages gross idolatry and polytheism prevailed. Later they yielded to theistic and Christian ideas, which contributed so much to progress and enlightenment. But these are nowadays, as we are told, antiquated and have given way to more advanced philosophy. And so, too, this latest phase of thought will fade away in the light of broader views, and is even now constantly changing and transforming. Accordingly, reason is by its very nature the source and mainspring of continuous errors, in so much that all its views and tenets, though first adopted as necessary truths, always prove false and will in all succeeding ages prove to be so; it is always searching for truth and always fancying to have reached it, yet never able to grasp it, but doomed to grope in darkness and error during all periods of human existence. Being such, is human reason yet trustworthy? Can its principles and conclusions still have any claim to credence and reliability? Is its light and evidence yet a motive for firm assent?

A theory that thus refuses to admit the testimony of consciousness as a proof for the existence of free-will ultimately terminates in universal skepticism, in the doubt about all views and positions ever held by philosophers. To seek to be rid of a well attested fact, contrary to an adopted theory, by calling it an illusion, is always dangerous and illogical, but in the present case it is simply suicidal, because the denial of the fact overturns the very theory which it is intended to uphold.

Considerations like these lead to the conclusion that experience, which is regarded by the determinists as the main source of knowledge and as the chief criterion of truth, establishes the existence of free-will beyond all doubt, grounding a conviction in us which cannot be overthrown without shattering the foundations of certitude. This might be a sufficient defense of freedom against determinism. Still, to search the matter deeper, let us advance further proofs taken from undeniable facts admitted also by modern thinkers.

V.

The moral and the social order no less than physical laws and phenomena are granted to be real existences, clearly manifested

throughout the history of mankind, and are universally considered to be of such importance that there neither is nor ever has been any system of philosophy which was not concerned with them and has not sought to give them support. Now in both these orders the freedom of will is implied as an essential constituent. Consequently, their reality granted, free-will must be admitted and cannot be denied without self-contradiction.

To prove this assertion an analysis of the moral order is necessary. What is peculiar to it so as to distinguish it from any other sphere or order? Obligation, accountability, virtue and vice, merit and demerit, retribution by reward and punishment. Let us begin with obligation. There are physical and moral laws. Physical laws establish a necessity which it is simply impossible to resist. Moral laws lay the rational will under a necessity which it is not impossible to resist, yet which to disobey is sin. It is this latter kind of necessity that is called a moral obligation and which we express by the words *we ought*. Though liable to be disobeyed, still it is conceived as inflexible and absolute, imposed on us ultimately by the highest power; wherefore no finite or created being can abolish it or exempt itself from it. Disobedience to it is the greatest of all disorders, not merely a folly, but a wrong, a sin and iniquity, attended by remorse and to be atoned for by the greatest penalties; whereas obedience to it is at once and with the fullest evidence understood to be an act of virtue deserving supreme reward. Not only has the necessity peculiar to moral obligation always been so conceived and explained in philosophical and theological schools, but it is felt to be such by the simple and unlettered as well as by the learned, by the wicked as well as by the virtuous.

Now does not obligation so defined necessarily suppose the freedom of will? It implies the perfect possibility of complying with it on the part of the will; for, indeed, absolute necessity of doing what is impossible is a pure absurdity; and it involves besides a no less complete and unimpeded possibility of not complying with it; for its violation is but too frequently an undeniable fact. But the possibility of doing a thing and of not doing it, of observing a law and of transgressing it in the presence of all prerequisites, is evidently the capability of the will to perform a given act and to omit it; a capability which was shown above to imply the power of choosing and of self-determination.

Furthermore, why is it that obedience to a law binding on our conscience is held to be an act of virtue and therefore praiseworthy, and why is the transgression of it considered as a sin and consequently blameworthy? Conformity with law constitutes order both in the physical and in the moral world. But never as yet has an

action conformable to physical laws, as for instance the fall of a stone, the flowing of a river to the ocean or the growth of a tree, been termed a virtue. Nor are those actions of rational beings which are performed with physical necessity, such as the assent of the intellect to a self-evident truth, called morally good, however perfect and well ordered they may be. Only the operations of the will conformable to the moral law are termed virtuous, and those, on the contrary, disagreeing with it, sinful. It is so in the languages of all nations. Whence this difference between the conformity of the will with the moral, and that of other forces with the physical law? And what is it that gives obedience to a moral law its special worth, raising it so high above conformity with any other law or order? There is only one answer possible. Obedience of our faculties to physical law is altogether the outcome of their nature and of external causes working on them. But obedience to the moral law, which is the right order of human conduct, is not predetermined by the nature and inclination of our faculties and the influence of the object proposed to them; no, it is the choice of our will, which has in its power the alternative to obey and to disobey, and which left unconstrained and undetermined, acts by its own decision. It is this that stamps upon the observance of the moral law its proper worth and dignity and gives it the value of virtue, while, on the other hand, it makes acts of disobedience to it sinful and constitutes their intrinsic baseness, which we all deem the greatest of all disorders. Evidently, then, the very conception of moral law and obligation imports free-will.

Further examination serves but to confirm this conclusion. A morally bad action causes remorse, a morally good one peace and approval of conscience. We do not feel remorse for actions, however injurious, which we have done through natural necessity or indeliberation, as for instance a misstep which caused a broken leg, or an involuntary want of foresight whereby we contracted a disease; nay, we could not even blame ourselves for such actions, since nature itself or attending circumstances forced them on us. We can reprove ourselves only when the evil act was brought about by our own determination, it being in our power to avoid it and to act differently. Likewise, there is reason for self-approbation, not when we have performed a well ordered or beneficent action unwittingly or under compulsion, but when we did it by our own choice. Nor is it our own conscience alone that rebukes and approves; the whole of mankind assigns blame to morally bad actions and to them alone, and praise to morally good actions and to these exclusively. Whatever acts of cruelty a wild beast may have done, we do not blame it for them, nor do we consider the murder committed by a

madman a guilt, nor do we, on the other hand, praise the gentle or useful actions of brutes as good and virtuous. Yet if a man, as for instance the assassin of our late President McKinley, commits murder, we abhor and detest the act as a crime and regard the doer as culpable. And when we see a man deliberately perform a good deed, as for instance an act of mercy, charity, forgiveness, devotedness to public welfare, we praise and honor him and bless his memory. Clearly actions of the former kind we do not deem worthy of praise or blame, because we are aware that they are not free, not determined by the agent himself, but by natural forces, not the outcome of his own will and decision, but of his nature and of circumstances. But on the latter kind of action we bestow praise or blame, because we conceive them as man's own deeds, coming from his determination and from his choice. And the more clearly the act is understood to be free and deliberate, resulting from man's own decision and not from overpowering influences, the more we blame it, if evil, or praise and admire it, if good. It is according to this standard that both in private and in public life murder or assault is judged and condemned and discharge of duty or acts of self-sacrifice are extolled and commended.

Moral actions have still another attribute of even higher importance. Not only do we blame ourselves for the transgression of a moral law, but we feel ourselves also responsible for it to the supreme authority which enacts and upholds moral obligation. But there is no consciousness of accountability in us for any such actions as are necessary or subject to physical laws, as for instance for the circulation of the blood, the digestion of the stomach, the growth of the body, the inability to understand a mathematical problem. Nor has ever any living being been called to account for them. Thus far horses, dogs and madmen have not yet been summoned to our courts to be accused of misdemeanors. For such are imputed to free men only. The very idea of accountability for necessary actions is absurd. Their performance or omission not being in our power, we are not masters of them, and they consequently cannot be imputed to us, but are ascribed to the causes which necessitated us. We can be accountable only for acts which are ours truly and in a strict sense, which depended on our own determination, to which no cause has constrained us, but which we ourselves chose rather to do than not to do. In short, responsibility is conceivable only for free actions.

He to whom we are accountable, be it the divine or the human judge, be it he whose judgment seat is in our own conscience or he who sits in an earthly court, pronounces our actions as being of good or ill desert and subject to retribution. Merit entitles us to an equivalent which is to be given for the good we have done in

behalf of others, as demerit requires the privation of a good equivalent to the evil we have done. Merit, therefore, and demerit imply the necessity of just retribution, which, when paid by authority, consists in proportionate rewards for good and in punishments for evil deeds. Moral actions have the highest merit and demerit and require retribution on the highest scale; for virtue and vice are the observance and violation of the supreme and most important order, and, therefore, we predicate the one the greatest of all goods attainable in this life and the other the greatest of all evils. Hence the fullest reward and punishment, reward consisting in the enjoyment of endless happiness, punishment consisting in utter loss and affliction, are hoped for or feared as most certain to be dealt out for them by the supreme and universal judge.

But, again, an action that is not free cannot possibly contract any merit or demerit, so as to be subject to retribution and especially to retribution of so grave a nature. No man can in justice require any reward or be subjected to punishment for an act which is not really his and which cannot be imputed to him. Reason, so far from demanding retribution of us in the shape of either reward or punishment for actions not our own, condemns it as a perversity and as the grossest injustice. When and where have human courts ever acted on a different principle? But an action is really ours only when it is free, that is, when it proceeds, not from any necessity, internal or external to us, as nature, character or circumstances, but from our choice and determination. It cannot be objected that we formed our character by our own preceding actions, and that therefore the present action that necessarily results from it is really and strictly ours. For our preceding actions were not free either. Before the character was formed they were the necessary outcome of the nature that was given to us and of external influence. Necessity of retribution, therefore, which is regarded as intrinsic to moral actions, is in the absence of free-will a perversion of justice, a contradiction to all principles of reason. And so it is with all other constituents and attributes of the moral order, with law and obligation, goodness and badness, virtue and vice, imputability and accountability; they become intrinsic contradictions the moment that self-determination or freedom is denied.

Consistently with determinism, then, there can be no moral order distinct from the material and physical order. Determinists may or may not draw this conclusion. If they shrink from it, they must renounce their theory; if they do not, they must put into the world a new kind of morality based on laws merely physical and organic. This latter alternative has, in fact, been adopted by many modern teachers of moral science. But with what consequences? Their

teachings degrade man to brute matter, blot out whatever is sublime, exalted and holy in his moral conduct, deny his destination for a higher end to be reached and enjoyed in a life of happiness to come, mock at his natural longing for immortality with all its concomitant pure and spiritual aspirations, seek to mar the conception of virtue and moral goodness, do away with the sacred motives inducing to perfect and holy actions, and abolish the absolute obligation of the moral law enjoining the observance of the right order, which is enacted by a supreme and irresistible power and urged by just and severe sanction.

Moreover, they forget that it is impossible to look on the ethical convictions of men since the spread of Christianity as mere fictions or errors. These are convictions that have struck the deepest roots in the human heart, so deep, in fact, that they have subdued the most vehement passions, overcome the fiercest attacks and withstood the exterminating influence of adverse philosophy. They have regenerated human society, changed the habits of mankind, corrected inveterate vices, inculcated the sublimest virtues, inspired the purest sentiments, given strength for the greatest sacrifices. Agnostic and positive philosophy does not deny these facts, but is compelled to grant that the moral belief fostered by the Christian religion has raised mankind to higher civilization, nay, was necessary to its enlightenment, improvement and progress. Convictions so deep, so strong, so universal, productive of so sublime virtues cannot be false and absurd; for absurdities cannot take a fast and stubborn hold on human reason, cannot produce goodness and perfection or be necessary for the rise and advancement of right conduct. The moral order as embodied in Christian ethics is not a deceitful fiction, but a genuine reality that has shed light, displayed wonderful beauty and effected the well-being of society in the course of many centuries.[6]

The moral order, then, being a reality, is an irrefragable proof for the existence of free-will. The social order is an argument no less convincing. It is essential to human society to be based on justice, on rights and obligations. By this characteristic feature it is distinguished from the physical universe, and especially from the aggregations we find in the animal kingdom. Thus far laws have not been enacted for brutes living in herds, flocks or hives; nor have they been deemed necessary, because animals are led by instincts, which are obeyed necessarily; or even possible, because they are beyond the reach of sensuous cognition. It is only of late that rights have been attributed to animals by certain writers. Courts and Legislatures, however, have thus far not recognized them. Did they in fact exist, certainly the first of them would be the right to

[6] Cf. M. Maher, "Psychology," fourth edition, pp. 398-406.

life and existence. But then killing and eating animals would be a crime no less than anthropophagy, and men and women of the most highly civilized and cultured classes would have to be looked on as cannibals. What is no less astonishing, these kind-hearted friends of the brute creation, so intent on the codification of animal rights, which man should regard, know in the absence of animal laws of no human rights which brutes should respect. If things are carried on in this line, it is to be feared that we shall soon be left to the mercy of wild beasts, poisonous snakes and pest-breeding insects.

Society, which is a union of persons harmoniously pursuing the same end, needs a norm by conformity to which harmony of action is established, and a bond whereby unity is effected and maintained. It is authority that gives existence both to the one and to the other by the enactment of laws, which create duties and rights. No state, no society could as yet exist without an authority endowed with law-making power. But laws, duties and rights presuppose free-will in man. Law, as far as it creates duties, imposes obligations which do not constrain us physically, because they can be disregarded, but constitute a moral necessity. For their binding power is independent of external circumstances, as well as of personal character or propensity, and, whilst it is just as possible to infringe as to observe them, they are always sacred, so much so that disregard of them is incurrence of guilt, an offense not only against the civil authority that enacted them, but also against the supreme ruler who is the author of society. In a word, the necessity and obligation of law is moral, and its observance or transgression is morally good or bad and subject to retribution by the supreme judge. Consequently it implies freedom of the will as the moral order in general does. Moreover, laws are enacted and imposed on man, and on man alone, just for the reason that he is thought to be free in his actions, able to determine his conduct by his own choice. Only free, self-determining beings require a norm and restraining rule; other creatures are not in need of it, because they are irresistibly necessitated by their nature or by external causes. For the same reason also that man is supposed to be master of his actions and not predetermined to them, he is called to account for the transgression of laws by human courts and punished according to justice. For accountability and retribution, as was shown above, are not conceivable but for free actions. By the very supposition, therefore, that there is no free-will in man, all our laws at once become unreasonable, our law-givers fools, our judges, when they punish criminals, perpetrators of gross injustice, and our whole civilization, in which we glory so much, an absurdity.

Laws enacted by authority also create rights to protect the mem-

bers of society and to secure for them their due share in the common good achieved by united social action. Rights created like duties presuppose the freedom of human will, from whatever point of view they may be considered. On the part of him who possesses it, a right is not a physical power to exercise compulsion, else the weaker ones, the children, the sick and in general the helpless would be deprived of rights, and oppressing or killing them would be no injustice; nor is it a force acting with necessity, for we make use of it as we please. Rights are therefore of a moral nature. On the part of him who has to respect them in others and to yield to their demands, they mean no physical necessity either, no compulsion exercised, since they are often trampled on; they consequently impose on him only a moral necessity, an obligation. This is understood also from the fact that he who has violated the lawful rights of others is considered guilty of a moral transgression, held accountable for his misdeed and subject to retribution, whereas he who is regardful of his fellow-men's rights is praised as good and virtuous. Thus rights belong to the moral order, in which freedom of will is implied as an essential constituent.

If we consider the end for which rights are conferred either by the law of nature or by positive laws, it will be plain to us that they aim at the protection of freedom. Their object is to establish free scope for our actions, to keep aloof undue interference on the part of those with whom we live, to ensure not only our life and existence, but also the means necessary and useful to reach our earthly destination in the manner we deem fit and have determined for ourselves. Does not modern science claim to have brought about this happy state of things, when it so boastfully glories that, by the enlightened views it has spread and the laws it has advised, men have been redeemed from the bondage of feudal ages and restored to the liberty due to their nature? Is not this the end and purpose of the modern political institutions, forms of government and administration of justice, all of which are calculated, it is said, to establish equality among men, to guarantee freedom of speech, freedom of the press, of religion, of trade and commerce, of government by the choice of the governed, and enactment of laws by the people or their representatives? Of course, the liberties thus secured are only external. But what does external liberty mean and aim at, if man has no power of choice and self-determination, if he is, like the things of brute creation, determined by his very nature or constrained by external influence? If man be such, what else is external liberty than a contradiction with his nature, an utter impossibility?

Perhaps, it is said, that through our modern institutions man has regained his freedom, inasmuch as he is no longer to be determined

from without, but by his own natural inclinations and acquired character. But it has already been remarked that, while we inherited nature from our parents and progenitors, our character was formed by our actions, which, if there be no free-will, are the necessary result of external influence. In this supposition the so-called external liberties would merely tend to preserve and consolidate contracted habits, and, consequently, to preclude progress and evolution in new directions. This, however, we are solemnly assured, is not the purpose of modern science and politics; ours is called an age of progress. We must therefore draw the conclusion that rights and social institutions, aiming at the guarantee and increase of external liberty in private and public life, presuppose the internal freedom of the will and are intended for its unimpeded exercise in the midst of the surroundings in which we are placed.

What must we in the face of this conclusion think of the double assertion mentioned in the beginning of our discussion, that, in our days, advanced science has done away with the fiction of free-will cherished in bygone times of darkness and ignorance, and has created true liberty after centuries of bondage? It is a plain self-contradiction, to which writers or speakers can commit themselves only when they neglect to ponder the meaning of the terms they employ, or utterly fail to understand the nature of social and political life and the end and purpose of civil society.

Evidently, then, free-will is involved in the social order, in its object, in its rights and corresponding duties, in its laws and institutions. It is involved no less necessarily in the moral order, in the conception of morality, of virtue and vice, of obligation, of accountability, of guilt, of merit and demerit, of retribution, reward and punishment according to human as well as divine justice.

Consequently it has real existence as truly as these two orders, the reality of which nobody dares deny, because they are too plainly revealed by the history of mankind and too deeply grounded in human nature. Free-will is, moreover, attested as an undeniable fact by our own consciousness so clearly, indeed, and so universally that nobody could as yet deny it without intricating himself in self-contradictions. Going beyond experience and tracing back free-will to its origin, we see it spring from the spirituality of the soul, from the unlimited scope of mind and will, from the power of the one to deliberate and the capability of the other to embrace or to reject any object presented to it which is not the fulness of all good, to embrace it on account of the good it contains and to reject it on account of the deficiency intrinsic to it. On the other hand, the determinists, to allege reasons for the denial of free-will, destroy everything that is great and elevated in human nature. They deny the spiritual nature

of the soul, thus to subject it to the necessary laws of matter, they disown the trustworthiness of consciousness, which testifies our self-determination, and thereby stultify human reason itself, they undermine and overturn both the moral and the social order, degrading man's directive principles to the level of mere instinct, his noblest deeds to necessary determinations arising from his organism and from external circumstances, his social life to gregariousness originated and controlled like that of brutes by sensitive sympathies.

Indeed the freedom of the human will is rooted on a solid foundation and is denied by a theory not only devoid of positive reason, but utterly destructive in its tendency. This is the final conclusion reached by our discussion.

When we opened our inquiry we saw old and new, Christian and anti-Christian philosophy, meet in a controversy of vital importance; the modern thinkers proud of their achievements, heaping disgrace on the ancient school, the latter scarcely allowed to utter a word in self-defense. Now after examination of the methods employed on both sides, after having weighed the proofs advanced and the results reached by either party, after having arrived at a well-grounded conclusion, some questions may well rise in the mind of many a reader. Which of the two schools aims at the real welfare of mankind? which upholds the true dignity of man and elevates the human race, promotes morality and consolidates society? which of the two secures rights and freedom to man, demands protection for him and allows his evolution in all directions? On which side is consistency, solid reasoning, careful analysis, unbiased inquiry? The answer cannot be doubtful. It is Christian philosophy alone that mankind may regard as the bulwark of its dignity, its freedom, its social peace and order. From anti-Christian thought it has to fear degradation, oppression, enslavement to matter. From the teachings of Christian philosophy, based in all its parts on reason and intelligence, issue enlightenment, spiritual knowledge, higher ideals, motives for exalted virtues; from anti-Christian theories, built merely on inductions from sensuous experience and on empiric knowledge, hostile to all that is supramundane and supersensible, follow laws of thought and conduct which forever bind the human mind and will down to the earth without the possibility of ever rising to the eternal truth or aspiring to the infinite good. If the divine saying, "*Veritas liberabit vos*," may be taken as a criterion, then Christian, not materialistic thought, is true philosophy.

John J. Ming, S. J.

Prairie du Chien, Wis.

AUSTRIAN EXPLORATIONS IN LYCIA.

I. The Lycian Inscriptions after the accurate copies of the late Augustus Schoenborn, with a critical Commentary and an Essay on the Alphabet of the Lycians. By Moritz Schmidt, Professor in Jena. Jena, 1868.

II. Beiträge zur Entzifferung der Lykischen Sprachdenkmäter. By J. Savelsburg. Bonn, 1874.

III. Vorläufiger Bericht über zwei österreichische Expeditionen nach Kleinasien, von Otto Benndorf. [Archaeologisch-epigrafische Mittheilungen aus Osterreich. Jahrgang VI. Wien, 1888.]

IV. Geschichte der Lykier von Dr. Oscar Treuber, Professor am Königl-Gymnasium in Tübingen. Stuttgart, 1887.

V. Reisen in sudwestlichen Kleinasien. Band I. Reisen in Lykien und Karien, ausgeführt im Auftrage des K. K., Ministeriums fur Cultus und Unterricht, beschrieben von Otto Benndorf und Georg Niemann. Mit einer Karte von K. Kiepert; 49 Tafeln, und zahlreichen Illustrationen im Text. Wien, 1884. Band II. Reisen in Lykien, Milyas und Kibiratis, ausgeführt auf Veranlassung der österreichischen Gesellschaft für archaeologische Erforschung Kleinasiens, beschrieben und herausgegeben von Eugen Petersen und Felix von Luschay. Mit 40 Tafeln und zahlreichen Illustrationen im Text. Wien, 1889.

VI. Das Heroon von Giölbaschi-Trysa, von Otto Benndorf und Georg Niemann. Mit 34 Tafeln und zahlreichen Abbildungen im Text. [Sonderdruck aus dem Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sämmlungen des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses.] Wien, 1889.

VII. Les Études d'Épigraphie Lycienne depuis 1820 jusqu'en 1888. J. Imbert. [In *Le Muséon, Revue Internationale.* Louvain, 1889-1890.]

THE systematic exploration of the topography and the antiquities of Southern Asia Minor, and especially of Lycia, one of its best known provinces, which has been carried out for some time by the orders of the Austrian Government, has already been fertile in important results. It is not only in the fields of philology and anthropology that an abundant harvest of documents and observations has been garnered, but the artistic treasures which have been brought back by the expedition, and which now enrich the Imperial Museum at Vienna, are of the greatest value for the history of art. These remarkable specimens of Grecian sculpture were taken from the wall surrounding a tomb which, though no inscription remained to record the name of its owner, seemed by its magnificence to have been the mausoleum of a ruler of the surrounding territory, and is now known as the Heroon (or Hero's tomb) of Giölbaschi, from the name of a neighboring village.

The Viennese archæologists cannot, however, claim the honor of having been the first to discover this monument which has furnished such an interesting contribution to our knowledge of Grecian art; it was first seen, many years previously, by a German professor, Johann August Schoenborn. He had hoped to persuade the Prussian Government to carry away the carvings which adorned it, but various obstacles frustrated his endeavors, the matter was allowed to drop, and as he never indicated the exact situation of the tomb, it was necessary to search for it again. Others, therefore, profited by his researches and reaped the reward he had earned by the privations and the hardships which shortened his life, but the services which he

has rendered to our knowledge of the archæology and of the geography of Asia Minor have placed him in the foremost rank of the travelers who have explored that country, and deserve to be related with some detail.

Schoenborn was the son of a clergyman and was born in 1801 at Meseritz in the Grand Duchy of Posen. He studied at the Universities of Berlin and Breslau, and become professor of theology and classical literature at the Gymnasium of Posen. It was not until rather late in life that he was enabled to execute a long cherished project of visiting Asia Minor, for which he had prepared by learning to speak Turkish and modern Greek, and having obtained six months' leave of absence he set out in August, 1841, with no other resources than a year's salary in advance (700 thalers, about $420) and a gift of 500 thalers (about $300) from the Minister of Education. He was accompanied by Dr. Loewe, a naturalist, and Herr Kiepert, the celebrated geographer, as far as Smyrna, where they separated and went in different directions in order to survey a greater extent of country.

At that time the interior of Lycia was as little known as that of Africa; an accurate survey of the coast had, indeed, been executed in 1812 by Captain Beauffort, and it had been published in 1822 in Colonel Leake's map of Asia Minor, but on the same map the rest of the province still remained blank. The expeditions of Sir Charles Fellows in 1838 and in 1840 revealed to the world the number of ruined cities which lay hidden in this mysterious land; but neither he nor M. Texier, who made a short excursion from the coast in 1836, had thrown much light on the topography of the country. Schoenborn had, therefore, no maps, and but little information to guide him when he began his explorations in October, 1841, accompanied by a single servant, and with no other scientific apparatus than a pocket compass and a boiling-point thermometer. His intention was to begin by acquiring an exact knowledge of the conformation of the district which might serve as a basis for his future antiquarian researches, and for this purpose he left the beaten tracks and followed the course of the principal rivers through dense forests and deep ravines, an undertaking accompanied with great fatigues and privations. After two months of continuous traveling he came to Adalia, where he intended to embark for Rhodes to meet Professor Loewe; but not finding a ship, he decided on trying another port. This necessitated a journey of several days over bleak mountains, where he had no other shelter than caves or shepherds' huts, till he reached the Monastery of St. Nicholas of Myra at the town of that name. It was on his way from thence to Antiphellus, across the elevated tableland surrounded by the river Dembretchai, that on December 20 he

found the tomb which the Austrian expedition rediscovered forty years later.

He could not, however, delay long enough to make a minute examination of the sculptures which ornamented the tomb, but was obliged to continue his journey to Xanthus, where, on the evening of the 27th, he met Sir Charles Fellows, who had landed there that morning on his third expedition, and from whom he carefully concealed his discovery. When at last he arrived at Rhodes he applied to the Prussian Envoy at Constantinople for leave to carry away the sculptures, and to the Administrators of the Royal Museum at Berlin for the requisite funds, requesting them at the same time to keep the matter secret.

At the end of February Schoenborn was at Smyrna and received there a prolongation of his leave of absence, and another allowance of 500 thalers, but no answer to his demands. The authorities at Berlin had, indeed, resolved to grant 6,000 thalers for the removal of the reliefs, and the Legation at Constantinople had applied for the necessary permission; but Schoenborn was too impatient to wait, and when the Imperial firman arrived a fortnight after his departure from Smyrna, Dr. Loewe, who received it, could not communicate with him, and declined to undertake the work without him. Schoenborn traveled from March to July through Caria, Lycia, Pamphylia, Isauria, Pisidia and a part of Phrygia, visiting the same localities more than once, in order to correct his previous observations, and Professor Benndorf, from whose interesting biography of Schoenborn these details are borrowed, assures us that all that is known up to the present of many districts in Southwestern Asia Minor is the result of these minute and toilsome researches.

Schoenborn returned to his professional duties in 1842; he published in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Græcarum* the inscriptions which he had copied, and gave to the Berlin Museum what remained of his collection of coins, for the most valuable of them had been stolen from him during his journey. Various causes hindered the publication of his travels, and he finally resolved to defer it until after another visit to Lycia. His manuscript has since been lost, and all efforts to trace it have proved unavailing, but he wrote a short description of the tomb for Falkener's "Museum of Classical Antiquities," without, however, indicating its situation, as he still hoped to persuade the Prussian Government to carry away the sculptures. The King, indeed, appeared to favor the project, but the Ministers were hostile to it, and it was not till the end of the year 1851 that, owing to the influence of Alexander von Humboldt and of the geographer Karl Ritter, he was enabled to revisit Lycia, better equipped than on his former expedition, and provided with photographic

apparatus. It was not a favorable moment for making researches in Asia Minor, for there had been destructive earthquakes which had caused much misery in Lycia; the country was much disturbed and many districts were infested by bands of robbers. In spite, however, of the brigands and of a fever which he contracted in Cilicia, Schoenborn made his way to Giölbaschi, but found, to his intense vexation, that after all the trouble he had taken to learn photography it was impossible to obtain satisfactory negatives of the reliefs. His favorable appreciation of these sculptures was then apparently so much modified by his disappointment that after examining their dilapidated condition more attentively than he had previously, he abandoned definitively all idea of removing them, and returned to Germany.

The remaining years of his life were occupied with literary work, but his health had been seriously affected by the fatigues of his second journey, and he never completely recovered from them. When at last he felt his end approaching he sent the notes taken during his travels to Karl Ritter, who published copious extracts from them in his *Erd-Kunde*, and expressed a very high opinion of their importance in a letter which Schoenborn received on his deathbed in September, 1857. It was the only compensation he ever obtained for the dangers and sufferings he had undergone, the only recognition of the services he had rendered to geographical and archæological research.

Schoenborn never revealed to any one the precise locality of the mausoleum, and it was not seen again until the Austrian expedition. In March, 1843, Lieutenant Spratt and Professor Forbes examined during three days the ruins of Cyaneæ, about four miles distant, and traversed the gorge of the Dembretchai, which lies below it; and in 1854 Messrs. Colnaghi and Berg followed the same road, passing within sight of the hill on which the edifice stands, without being aware of its existence. The name of the neighboring village of Giölbaschi was at length published in the last volume of the *Erd-Kunde*, which appeared in 1859; so that when in 1880 the Austrian Government decided on continuing its archæological researches in the East, Professor Benndorf suggested that an expedition should be sent to explore the mountainous districts of Caria and Lycia, with the special object of searching for the Greek tomb seen by Schoenborn. His proposal was accepted, a frigate was placed at the service of the mission, and on April 16, 1881, Professor Benndorf, George Niemann, an architect, Wilhelm Burger, photographer to the Imperial Court, and Dr. Felix von Luschan disembarked at the port of Kekova on the Lycian coast, on the mountains above which it was thought probable that the monument was situated.

The interior of Lycia is occupied by Alpine ranges, among which the Susuz-Dagh rises to a height of 7,800 feet above the sea, and the Ak-Dagh to 9,100; and in front of them lies an elevated tableland with precipitous sides which forms the southwestern extremity of Asia Minor. Its shape is nearly triangular, it is about twenty miles long from east to west, by ten miles broad from north to south; on its northeastern and northwestern sides it is separated from the mountains behind it by the deep and narrow gorge of the Dembretchai, while to the south it descends towards the sea by a succession of terraces. The interior of this district is intersected by chains of low rocky hills, thickly covered with brushwood; the intervening valleys are fertile, though there are no springs, and the many ruins still subsisting bear witness to the density of the population in ancient times.

The eastern angle of this tableland, where it attains its greatest height (2,598 feet above the sea), is cut off from the rest by a deep valley, above which the long narrow ridge about 60 feet broad by 600 feet in length, on which stands the tomb, rises abruptly to the height of 900 feet. The enclosure which surrounds the tomb is built against the eastern declivity of this ridge; its northern side is a steep precipice which falls into the ravine of the Dembretchai; but towards the south it slopes away gently and is covered with fragments of sarcophagi and ruins of houses. The level ground at its base, where were found the remains of a temple dedicated to Zeus Eleutherios and to the Sun-god, was probably the *agora* or market place of the little town which occupied this strong position.

Like Schoenborn before him, Herr Benndorf describes with enthusiasm the thrilling impression he experienced when, after a fatiguing ascent from the seashore, he entered the enclosure where, during so many centuries, had lain forgotten and unknown the treasures which now adorn the Museum of Vienna. All around, filling the interior of the walled-in space and partly concealed by dense thickets of brushwood, lay broken sarcophagi and shattered blocks of stone, while above them rose tall forest trees, the growth of centuries; but the frieze was still in its place, crowning the walls with sculptures of sieges and banquets, of combats and sacrifices; and the splendor of the surrounding landscape which united the stern grandeur of Switzerland to the rich coloring and the dazzling sunshine of a Southern climate, formed a background worthy of these masterpieces of Greek art.

Having thus found the building, which was the principal object of the expedition, and fully recognized the artistic value of the reliefs which decorated it, Herr Benndorf and his companions proceeded to explore the western part of Lycia and the adjacent province of Caria.

They visited many towns already described by Sir Charles Fellows and other travelers, where they gathered an abundant harvest of inedited inscriptions, and at the same time they did not neglect to observe the present condition of the country. Their attention was chiefly attracted by the rapid growth and the increasing prosperity of the Greek population. The port of Makri, for instance, is one of those thriving settlements which have been founded within the last few years along this coast by immigrants from the islands of the archipelago, and which, like their predecessors, the Greek colonies of earlier days, will eventually exercise considerable influence on the development of this part of Asia Minor. Even now almost all the commerce and industry of the west coast are in the hands of Greeks; at Makri alone their activity has raised the annual value of the exports to over £80,000 ($400,000) and of the imports to over £40,000 ($200,000); while the masons, the smiths and the carpenters of the colony are in great request in the surrounding districts. The Greek tradesmen, and especially the millers, are also money-lenders; little by little the mortgaged farms of the Turkish peasantry are passing into their possession; they then bring over their own countrymen to occupy them, and the Mahommedan population is thus gradually driven back into the interior.

A remarkable feature in the scenery of Lycia are the funereal monuments of various sorts scattered in great numbers over the face of the country. They have been carefully studied by the archæologists of the Austrian expedition and classified according to their antiquity. The earliest in date are in the form of low oblong cells cut into the rock, such as those which cover the face of the lofty precipices round the acropolis of the city of Pinara. They were apparently not closed, and can only have been accessible by scaffoldings let down from above by ropes. Of a somewhat later epoch are the tombs, also cut in the rock, where a frontage of a decorative character has been added to the cell, or where the surrounding rock has been cut away till the tomb has been given the form of an isolated monolithic edifice. In these cases the tomb reproduces exactly all the characteristics of a wooden house with its paneled walls, the ties which bind them, the projecting ends of the beams which sustain the ceiling and the pointed arch raised above it, as though it were a bower or a tent constructed on the flat roof. Others, again, are in the form of a sarcophagus raised upon a high pedestal, and it is believed that of this class no less than two thousand still exist in Lycia. The base of these monuments and the *hyposorion*, or lower chamber in which the slaves were buried, were sometimes cut out of a rock; the sarcophagus was of one piece, and its heavy cover of ogival shape, often decorated with scenes of warfare and of feasting, was

provided with projecting bosses carved to resemble the heads of lions or of Gorgons, by means of which it could be raised when another corpse was to be placed in the common sepulchre. For these sarcophagi were family tombs, reserved by the builder for the members of his household, and, according to the epitaphs hitherto under pain of a fine to be paid to the municipality. Latest of all and probably not earlier than 400 B. C., are the tombs which, though cut on the face of some apparently inaccessible cliff, according to the ancient usage of Lycia, show the influence of Greek culture by their columns with Ionic capitals, and their pediments ornamented with *acroteria* which give them the aspect of the portico of a Greek temple.

The most fatiguing part of this journey was that through the valley of the Dolomantchai (the ancient Indos), which forms the western boundary of Lycia and flows between chains of lofty mountains, from whose snow-clad summits innumerable torrents rush down through deep ravines to join it. The forest of gigantic fir trees which covers the country renders it impossible to make an exact survey. Schoenborn was the first to explore this district, but in spite of his labors and those of Benndorf, its topographical conformation is still uncertain.

On leaving this wilderness for the plains of Caria, the travelers were agreeably surprised to find instead of the poverty and decay prevailing throughout Lycia well cultivated fields, large and neat villages of two-storied houses and a well-fed, well-clad peasantry of purely Turkish race. The only ancient remains in this part of the country are those of the Temple of Hecate at Lagina, which are now, unfortunately, used as a quarry by the neighboring population. It is to be hoped that Herr Benndorf may succeed in carrying away, as he intends to do, the reliefs covering the frieze, which represents a combat of Titans.

The interest excited in Vienna by the drawings and photographs brought back from Lycia led to the formation of a society for the archæological exploration of Asia Minor under the patronage of His Imperial Highness the Archduke Rainer, and a second expedition was organized in the beginning of 1882 for the special purpose of bringing back the sculptures of Giölbaschi. Herr Petersen of Prague was named director, and by the end of April he and his colleagues, Herr Knaffe-Lenz, an engineer; Dr. Emil Tietze, a geologist, and the archæologists, Drs. Loewy and Studniczka, were encamped together with a numerous band of workmen in the neighborhood of the tomb. The removal of the reliefs was an arduous undertaking; for, even when the thickness of the blocks of stone which bore the carvings was reduced by one-half, they were still too heavy to be transported by the steep and narrow paths leading to the sea.

A winding road was, therefore, made, descending by easy gradients into the gorge through which flows the Dembretchai, 2,400 feet below the rocks of Giölbaschi, and the reliefs were brought on sledges down this road to the port of Andraki and safely embarked.

The Alpine character of Lycia, separated from the adjoining provinces by chains of lofty mountains and divided by their offshoots into numerous valleys having little communication with each other and scantily provided with arable land, gave rise to the formation of many small independent states which, owing to the rugged and sterile nature of the country, were debarred from ever acquiring wealth or power. It was only in the fertile tracts of land situated at the mouths of the great rivers, or along their course, that large communities could arise, flourishing by commerce and agriculture and displaying a magnificence of which their ruins still preserve the traces. It was, therefore, all the more surprising to discover a tomb ornamented with a profusion of sculptures evidently of Attic workmanship on the site of what must have been an insignificant mountain village, the very name of which was unknown till the discovery of a fragment of a shattered inscription showed it to have been Trysa.

The mausoleum occupied the entire width of the narrow ridge of rock which constituted the Acropolis of the town; it consisted of a rectangular court about 25 yards by 20, with walls a yard thick and three yards high on the inner side. The door was placed high above the outside level of the ground and was accessible only by means of a ladder. The sarcophagus, which had been broken to pieces, had been cut from a rock which did not occupy the exact centre of the enclosed space, and stood facing towards a corner of the court where there were some traces remaining of a room in which the members of the family of the founder could assemble to celebrate the annual sacrifices in honor of the dead. The tomb, therefore, presented a very complete example of a Greek Heroon; the grave of an ancestor who had been raised to the rank of a hero, and round which extended a *temenos*, or sacred enclosure.

From the wall over the doorway stood out in bold relief the heads and shoulders of four winged bulls, which, together with the Gorgon's head beneath them, were probably meant to serve as *ἀποτροπαια* or charms to guard against the evil eye—a curious and unusual combination of Greek and Asiatic symbolism. On the inner side the door-posts were ornamented with life-size figures of dancing youths clad in light tunics and wearing the *calathos*, a basket-shaped headdress worn in funeral ceremonies; and on the lintel a row of eight dwarfish misshapen figures resembling the Egyptian divinity Bes, dancing with grotesque gestures and playing on various

instruments, bore witness to the influence of some barbaric religion foreign to the Hellenic race.

Two reliefs next the door and representing, one, a four-horsed chariot carrying a warrior, and the other, the combat of Bellerophon with the Chimaira, may perhaps be looked on as the heraldic cognisances of the prince interred in the Heroon. As in a mountainous country like Lycia chariots must have been seldom employed, Herr Benndorf is of opinion that this emblem, which is also found on some of the sarcophagi of Xanthos, cannot be considered as the commemoration of a victory in the arena, but rather as a symbol of illustrious descent and supreme authority; while the image of Bellerophon would indicate that the ruler of Trysa regarded that hero as his ancestor.

The reliefs, which were disposed in two rows along the frieze of the wall surrounding the enclosure, were executed in the coarse white limestone which abounds in the immediate vicinity, and have suffered much from the weather, showing in some places nothing but the outline and the general movement of the figures. It is probable that they were tinted, for in many instances it is evident that color was employed to represent minor details too minute for the rough grain of the stone. The total surface which they cover is not less than 120 square yards, and the dissimilarity which exists between different parts of the frieze with regard to the execution and the proportions of the figures proves that several sculptors must have been simultaneously employed. The style of workmanship, however, and the spirit which animates the entire series designate them unmistakably as belonging to the Athenian school. No less characteristic of that school are the subjects selected; for, with few exceptions, they are derived from the Iliad, the Odyssey or the Cylic poets, and are identical with those which Polygnotus and Micon painted in the public buildings of the chief cities of Greece, and the striking resemblance between the composition of many groups, or the attitudes of single personages, and those to be found on the Athenian vases with red figures dating from the latter half of the fifth century B. C. might suggest that some well-known and much admired original work had inspired both the sculptor and the potter. The description, too, given by Pausanias of the paintings of Polygnotus and Micon convey the impression that they were in the form of a frieze bearing a continuous succession of detached scenes arranged in two tiers rather than that of separate pictures.

The return of Ulysses and the slaughter of the suitors, which Polygnotus had painted in the temple of Athena Areia at Plateæ, forms the subject of the upper relief to the left of the door. The King of Ithaca is seen advancing hastily, bending his bow, while the

suitors, startled by his sudden appearance, rise from their couches and seek in vain to shelter themselves from his arrows by holding up the tables and the footstools of the banqueting hall. Telemachus accompanies his father, and, through an open door, is seen the treacherous Melanthius passing to the chamber where the arms were kept. Behind Ulysses the herdsman Gumaios, clad in goat skins and bearing a sword and a torch, turns towards Penelope, to whom Eurykleia presents her handmaids. Two of them, by their attitudes, show submission and repentance, but the third rushes with wild gestures towards the hall. The text of the Odyssey, therefore, as it exists at present, according to which the suitors were slain while Penelope slept and before she had recognized Ulysses, has not been followed; but, as in other representations of the same scene to be found on painted vases or sarcophagi, women are shown assisting at the slaughter, it is possible that there may have existed an earlier version of the legend which was preferred by the artist.

Below the episode from the Odyssee is the chase of the wild boar of Calydon. In the centre of the composition the hunters are grouped round the monster, which stands at bay; their attitudes are full of life and energy, their cloaks and tunics flutter in the air; Theseus wields his club, Peleus brandishes his lance, Atalanta sends an arrow from her bow, others further off hurl stones; but the Attic feeling for grace of outline and symmetry of design is always present, and the fury of the struggle does not disturb the harmonious arrangement of the scene. Towards each end of the relief the action of the personage becomes gradually less violent. Other warriors advance to help their chiefs; the fallen are gently borne away, and a youth draws water from a well to bathe their wounds.

The sculptures on the western wall form, as it were, a triptych in which are epitomized the principal events of the siege of Troy, and they cover the two courses of blocks which constitute the frieze. The section to the left represents a battle between Greeks and Trojans near to the ships, which are drawn up in line on the shore; a trumpeter gives the signal for the fight; then follows a series of encounters where the central point of the scene is marked by the closer grouping and greater animation of the combatants. The representation of the attack on Troy which occupies the middle portion of the whole composition is the only one of all those formerly existing in ancient art which has been preserved to the present day and possesses, therefore, a special interest. Two detachments of lightly armed Greek soldiers are seen climbing the rocks on which stands the besieged town, and holding their shields over their heads to guard against the stones hurled from the battlements; two other bands, more heavily armed, attack the gates, and one of them seems

to have already forced an entrance. Above them two rows of Trojan soldiers are seen in perspective, as though they lined the walls of an inner court forming a second line of defense, while others hasten along the ramparts to reinforce them. Near the centre of the scene are enthroned a King and Queen, in whom we may recognize Helen and Priam. The King, an aged man, leans upon a long staff; slaves stand beside him and a panther crouches beneath his throne. The Queen, a young and beautiful woman, is seated at a somewhat higher level, and an attendant holds an umbrella over her head. Further to the left, close to a temple, an armed warrior stands with uplifted hands in the attitude of prayer, while another kneeling at his feet sacrifices a ram. The neighboring towers are strongly garrisoned and their defenders shower stones and darts on the besiegers. At the opposite end of the relief are two groups of fugitives escaping from the city. The upper one, composed of a man and a woman driving a donkey laden with sacks, seems to be ascending through a rocky country; below them in the plain rides a lady guarded by an armed man; her saddle, the only specimen to be found in Greek art, is a chair placed sideways on her mule and provided with a support for the feet.

The third division of this triptych shows a succession of single combats between Greeks and Amazons, the former on foot and the latter mostly on horseback. The central group represents an Amazon armed with hatchet and shield springing from her horse, which kneels to let her alight, as the horses of the Scythians were trained to do, and who is attacked by a warrior distinguished from the others by the lofty crest which surmounts his helmet. Herr Benndorf believes that the subjects of these reliefs were taken from the *Æthiopis*, the lost epic of Arktinos of Miletos, which related the landing of the Greeks in Troas; the battle which ensued; the arrival of the Amazons as allies of King Priam and the death of their Queen Penthesilea, slain by Achilles, who fell shortly afterwards while attempting to storm the Scæan gate. The sculptors who decorated the mausoleum at Trysa may not perhaps have brought with them copies of the wall paintings of Athens, but the many traits of resemblance between the attitudes of the Amazons in these reliefs and those on the early vases with red figures prove the existence of a type created by the genius of a master and imitated by less distinguished artists. Moreover, the order in which the reliefs are placed coincides with that of the frescoes in the *Stoa Porkile* at Athens as described by Pausanias, where the *Iliupersis* or taking of Ilium of Polygnotos was painted between the battle of Marathon by Panainos and the victory of Theseus over the Amazons by Micon.

Polygnotos had also painted in the temple of the Dioskuroi at

Athens the abduction by Castor and Polydeukes of Hileaira and Phoibe, the daughters of Leukippos, during the celebration of their marriage feast, and the same legend forms the subject of the reliefs on the northern wall. A temple stands in the centre of the composition; beside it the sacrificers are skinning and cutting up the victims. Further on are large cauldrons, tables laden with offerings and tall wine jars. The chorus of maidens which stood by the altar has been scattered by the sudden irruption of the twin brothers, who carry away the brides on their four-horsed chariots, while the male guests, snatching up their weapons, hasten to the rescue, and the bridegrooms, Lynkeos and Idas, mount their steeds and lead the pursuit.

Nearly all the eastern wall had been leveled with the ground; an act of vandalism probably committed during a siege by the defenders of the acropolis in order to prevent an enemy from approaching the fortress under cover of the Heroon; and it may, perhaps, have taken place during the war between Haroun-al-Raschid and the Emperor Nicephorus in A. D. 808, when the Saracens destroyed the shrine of St. Nicolas of Myra, situated in that neighborhood. Enough, however, of fragments of the shattered reliefs was collected to show that they had represented the exploits of Theseus, always a favorite subject of the artists of Athens.

A scene of feasting and revelry, showing men reclining on couches and drinking, while women and children dance before them to the sound of the flute, fills the last portion of the frieze, which is placed at a lower level than the rest, as though it had decorated the interior of the room which, judging by the traces left on the wall, must have been constructed at this angle of the enclosure.

The reliefs of the outer frieze, which crowns the outer wall of the Heroon on each side of the doorway facing the sea, have suffered much from the weather, and in some places can hardly be traced. Those to the left represent, in the upper row, a battle between Amazons and Greeks; in the lower, the fight between the Centaurs and the Lapithæ at the marriage of Peirithoos. Here also a resemblance may be perceived between some of the groups which compose this relief and those which are found in other Greek works of the fifth century, such as the metopes of the Parthenon, the frieze of the temple of Philgaleia and the western pediment of the temple of Olympia; but they have still more in common with the figures on the vases of the same epoch, and these were probably derived from the painting by Micon in the temple of Theseus which represented the same legendary traditions.

The subject of the upper relief to the right of the door appears to have been taken from the *Thebaïs*, another of the lost poems of the

Epic Cycle which described the expedition of the Seven Chiefs against Thebes. In the centre of the composition Eteocles and Polyneikos fight over the body of a warrior, surrounded by other groups of combatants; while at one end of the scene, the quadriga of Adrastos is borne away rapidly by his steeds, and at the other the seer Amphiareos descends on his chariot into Hades. The walls of Thebes are indicated by a single tower, and from a ladder raised against it Capaneus is hurled by a thunderbolt.

In the lower relief, at one end an aged King is seen seated on his throne, and around him are warriors putting on their armor. In the centre is a combat against troops who have just disembarked from ships drawn up on the shore; one of the invaders is carried away lifeless on his shield, and a youth springs from one of the ships and hastens to take part in the fray. The subject of this relief cannot be identified by comparing it with any other work of art; it stands alone, but Herr Benndorf supposes that it depicts the landing of the Greek army in Troas as described in the *Cypria* of Stasinos, and the opening of the ten years' war by a battle in which Protesilas, the first man to set his foot on Trojan soil, was slain by Hector and avenged by Achilles, who killed Cycnos, the son of Poseidon.

The limits of this article will not admit of more than a brief notice of the minute analysis by means of which Herr Benndorf has traced the connection between these sculptures and the masterpieces of Micon and Polygnotos and has proved that they must have been executed in the latter half of the fifth century B. C. He points out, among other peculiarities, that the carefully drawn perspective of the towers and gates of Troy, the steep rocks up which the besieging forces clamber, the defile leading to the mountains which the fugitives enter, and the picturesque character of the entire series of reliefs have more in common with the freedom of landscape painting than with the reserve and sobriety of plastic art, and suggest that some picture where scenery formed a background to the figures furnished the sculptors with the fundamental idea, if not, indeed, with many of the details of their work.

It is from a study of these details that the date of the Heroon can be approximately ascertained. It was the fashion, for instance, in the fifth century to wear the girdle over the hips, as do the female personages in these reliefs; in the following century it was worn under the breasts. The forms of the weapons, too, agree with those depicted on the vases of the fifth century, and it is remarkable that, just as in the reliefs on monuments of the same epoch, such as the temple of Theseus, the Parthenon and the temple of Victory, the warriors on the frieze of the Heroon do not wear greaves. It is also on the vases of the latter half of the fifth century that chariots drawn

by horses at full gallop first appear, a progress in art attributed to Micon.

A striking peculiarity in the sculptures of Trysa is the care with which the artists have avoided any representation of the nude, for, with only two exceptions, all the figures are draped. Herr Benndorf can only account for this departure from the usual practice of Greek art by supposing that it may have been a concession to the aversion felt by Orientals for the nude; or, considering that Pausanias when describing the works of Polygnotos, rarely mentions undraped figures, but gives very full details with regard to arms and costumes, it may have been a characteristic of that painter, and would thus form another link between him and the sculptors of the Heroon. Herr Benndorf leaves the nationality of these artists an open question, but they cannot have been natives of Lycia. That land of warlike mountaineers was not sufficiently wealthy to develop a school of native art, and the unknown sculptors who carved the reliefs of Trysa must have come from without, perhaps from Rhodes, the nearest point whence the influence of Greek culture could penetrate into the Lycian peninsula.

The identity of the prince for whom the Heroon was erected is another open question to which no answer can ever be given. A solution of the problem might perhaps be found in the inscription on the obelisk at Xanthos,* in which Chreis, the son of Harpagos, returns thanks to the gods for having by their aid stormed many citadels, which he then bestowed on his relations, together with a share of his royal authority. Herr Benndorf, who assigns this inscription to the early half of the fifth century, believes that the ruler of Trysa may have been one of these lieutenants, and the image of Bellerophon, from whom many of the native aristocracy claimed to be descended, would seem to prove that he was a Lycian, while respect for his religious belief may possibly account for the presence over the doorway of the uncouth figures so foreign to the genius of Greek art. They may perhaps represent the Phenician Kabirim, "the strong gods," inventors of the art of navigation, the eight divinities who personified the seven planets and the starry firmament in which they move; or the Patœci, grotesque images affixed to the prows of the Phenician galleys as guardian deities. In either case, their maritime character might suggest that the acropolis of Trysa was the stronghold of one of the pirates who infested the coasts of Asia Minor, and that when he built himself a mausoleum worthy of his fame and his wealth, he placed over the entrance the misshapen idols in whose protection he had confided, without heeding how much their deformity contrasted with the graceful forms around them.

*G. Kaibel, "Epigrammata Graeca," p. 310

The most important of the Greek inscriptions collected by the second Austrian expedition is that brought from the ruins of Rhodiapolis. It had been discovered by Lieutenant Spratt and Professor Forbes, who copied only a third of it. It is a collection of twelve letters from various Roman Emperors, nineteen from Imperial Legates and Procurators, and thirty-three decrees of the Lycian Confederation with dates ranging from 126 to 163 A. D., thanking a wealthy citizen of Rhodiapolis named Opramoas for the services he had rendered to his country, and conferring on him in return various honors, such as the right to have his portrait painted on a golden shield and his statue raised in bronze; to wear a golden crown and a purple garment and to occupy a front seat at the public games. Opramoas appears to have held many important posts in his native city, and in the Lycian Confederation, such as Lyciarch or President, and High Priest, and while exercising these functions he had distributed corn to the people, he had built temples and baths and given large sums to restore public buildings which had been ruined by an earthquake about the year 142 A. D.

These inscriptions give also much information with regard to the political organization of Lycia after the Emperor Claudius had taken away its autonomy and made it a Roman province. The ancient titles of the dignitaries of the Confederation still survived, but those who bore them had little real authority. There were still a Lyciarch who represented the community in its dealings with the Roman Procurator; a High Priest, who sacrificed to the Emperor as well as to the Gods of Lycia; a Strategos, or General; an Archiphylax charged with the maintenance of order, and the cities of the Confederation still sent representatives to a General Assembly. The powers of this body, however, were limited to voting money for the celebration of feasts and distributing rewards to deserving citizens, while the Procurator assisted at its deliberations; its decrees were confirmed by him, and its correspondence with the Emperor passed through his hands.

Many inscriptions in the Lycian language were also brought back by the expedition, and they may perhaps help to dispel the mystery which still envelops the Lycian race and dialect; for, up to the present, the interpretation of most of the epitaphs is purely conjectural, and the phonetic value of some of the letters is still undetermined. Sufficient progress, however, has been made in deciphering these remains to show that the Lycian language belongs to the Indo-European family, forming a link between the Iranian languages and the Greek; and that it has most affinity with the old Bactrian dialect of the Zend on one side and the Cretan dialect on the other.

Such a favorable opportunity as the expedition presented of acquiring information with regard to the numerous races which people Asia Minor was not neglected. Dr. Felix von Luschan was charged with the investigation into the anthropology of Lycia, and his report gives interesting details about its inhabitants, the great majority of whom, though professing the Mohammedan religion and speaking Turkish, is not of the Turkish race, but represents the ancient population of the country, on which the conquerors imposed their language and their creed. Dr. von Luschan's attention was especially drawn to two tribes distinguished from their fellow-countrymen by the singularity of their mode of life: the Tachtadschy or "Sawyers," and the Yuruks, or "Wanderers."

The former, who follow the trade of wood-cutters, lead a secluded life in the great forests of the lofty mountain ranges, dwelling both in summer and in winter in small round tents covered with felt, and coming very rarely into the towns. When they are in the society of Turks they profess to be Mohammedans; the government looks upon them as such, and they are therefore subjected to conscription; but they drink wine and eat pork; they do not recite the five daily prayers of the orthodox Mohammedans, and their women go unveiled. They conceal carefully their religious belief, and to ensure greater secrecy its more recondite doctrines are imparted only to the men of the tribe. All that Dr. von Luschan can state with certainty on the subject is that in each clan there is a spiritual head called the "Dede," or "Baba," whose dignity is believed to be transmitted after his death to one of his sons or to some other member of the same clan into whom his soul passes. Once a year the "Dede" calls together the families which compose his flock; they assemble in the evening and after the repetition of a long and monotonous chant the soul of some departed "Dede," or of the prophet Ali, is supposed to enter into one of the assistants, who then becomes a medium and foretells future events. The meeting is ended by a general confession of sins which the "Dede" is supposed to drive by his incantations into a thick stick wrapped up in colored stuffs, and they are remitted by burning the stick and throwing its ashes into running water or burying them in the earth. Among other peculiarities of this strange race it may be noticed that they do not shave their heads nor clip their beards like the Turks, and that they always hold with both hands the vessel out of which they drink, a practice of which Dr. von Luschan can give no explanation. A striking similarity exists between what is known of the religious tenets of the Tachtadschys and those of other equally mysterious Asiatic sects, such as the Ansarich in northern Syria, the Kizilbash in western Kurdistan and the Yezyde in upper Mesopotamia; but it is not certain whether they

are the remains of some early pagan worship or merely corrupt and degenerate offshoots of Islam.

A tendency to a wandering life is very general among the inhabitants of Asia Minor, especially along the southern coast, where every year the entire Mohammedan population of hundreds of villages abandons its houses and migrates with all its goods and chattels to encamp among the mountains, sometimes at a distance of several days' journey, in upland valleys and pastorages called Yailas; but the Yuruks, who must not be confounded with the Gipsies, to whom, however, they are closely related, are true nomads and never dwell in a house. Their tents, which are peculiar to them and to no other tribe, are of an oblong shape, supported by nine poles, woven of black goats' hair and strengthened by mats placed round the sides. Their chief industries are cattle breeding and carpet weaving. They are reputed to be Mohammedans, and they refrain from wine and pork and make the pilgrimage to Mecca, but they do not observe the Ramadan, and their women go unveiled. They are the only race in Asia Minor in which it is the custom to deform the heads of newly born children, which is done by binding them tightly with damp cloths, but the practice seems to be now dying out. Like the Gipsies they are newcomers in Lycia, and like them, too, their physical characteristics point to India or to some land on its northwestern frontier as their original home. A clue to its locality might perhaps be obtained through a knowledge of the tongue which the Yuruks speak among themselves when they do not wish to be understood by the Turks, and of which Dr. Luschan could not succeed in learning more than a few words.

The final conclusion at which Dr. Luschan has arrived with regard to the inhabitants of Lycia is that they can be divided into two classes: those who have long skulls corresponding to the type generally found in early Greek tombs, and still prevailing at the present day throughout the Greek islands, and who may therefore be regarded as the descendants of the Greek colonists; and those with very high short skulls, a medium stature, dark straight hair and dark complexion. The former are generally to be found in the towns and along the coast, the latter in isolated localities such as mountainous districts or marshy lands. These are considered to be the remains of the primitive pre-Grecian population, which still exists in large masses in the highlands of Armenia. To this type belong the Tachtadschys and those Eastern tribes who profess similar religious beliefs. The same type is also found among the Syrian mountains, and there it is certainly pre-Semitic; the necessary elements, it is true, are wanting to establish a definite relation between the two groups, but there can be no doubt that they are closely con-

nected. Dr. von Luschan is of opinion that it is in Central Asia, where, up to the present, very little has been done in the way of anthropological measurement, that should be sought the solution of the problems relating to the origin, not only of the inhabitants of Syria and Asia Minor, but also, perhaps, of the short-skulled races of Europe, which are the remains of a very early population.

In concluding this article a tribute of well merited praise must be rendered to Herr Benndorf and his fellow-workers; to the Society for the Archæological Exploration of Asia Minor, and to the Austrian Government for the splendidly printed and profusely illustrated volumes in which the antiquarian and scientific results of both expeditions have been given to the public. The eighty-nine plates which accompany them are excellent specimens of héliogravure, and together with the fac-similes of pen and ink sketches inserted in the text, they place vividly before our eyes the wild and romantic scenery of Lycia, the types of the various races which inhabit the country and the ruins of the ancient cities which, even in their decay, still bear witness to their former greatness and splendor.

DONAT SAMPSON.

London, England.

ST. IGNATIUS AND JOHN BUNYAN.[1]

"RELIGION is losing its hold on the masses" is a sentence that has gone the round of England for many a year. We might add, "and of the classes also;" and we might be tempted to alter "is losing" into "has lost." *The fear of the Lord*, the Psalmist says, *is the beginning* (or mainstay) *of religion*. Never, probably, was God less feared, never were the judgments of God less dreaded in Christendom than at the present day. "The conviction of sin," as it used to be called in a certain school, that is, the sense of being in deadly sin, an object of God's wrath, and in proximate danger of going to hell, and the restless alarm thereupon consequent—all this state of mind is becoming rarer and rarer upon the earth. Religion is going out of demand, like a remedy for an obsolete malady, like furred garments in August, or cooling drinks in the Arctic Circle. So at least it would seem, but we must ever remember that religion has its chief seat in the heart; and men do not wear their hearts, or their religion either, on their sleeve. *The Lord seeth*

[1] "The Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius," literally translated from the Spanish. Burns & Oates. "The Testament of Ignatius Loyola," with Preface by George Tyrrell, S. J. Sands & Co. Bunyan. "The Pilgrim's Progress," "Grace Abounding," etc. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1900.

the heart. Where He sees in any heart no vestige of fear of His judgments, He sees in that heart little or no religion either.

Among the last words in St. Ignatius' "Spiritual Exercises" are these:

> We ought greatly to praise the fear of His Divine Majesty: because not only is filial fear a pious and holy thing, but also servile fear [*i. e.*, fear of God's punishments], in the case of one who cannot attain to anything better or more profitable, is a great aid to assist him in rising out of deadly sin.

It would not be easy to find a clearer instance of the working of this rule than in John Bunyan. As a child, his sleep was disturbed with dreams of hell and of the day of judgment. These left him after a while, and then, he says of himself: "Until I came to the state of marriage, I was the very ringleader of all the youth that kept me company, in all manner of vice and ungodliness." His ungodliness consisted particularly in swearing, so that a woman "told me," he says, "that I was the ungodliest fellow for swearing that ever she heard in all her life;" also in "sports and plays," such as bell-ringing, dancing, and games at "cat" on Sundays.[2] So Ignatius Loyola for the first twenty-five years of his life lived in the "somewhat uncontrolled freedom of his youth," as he acknowledged to Father Gonzalez ("Testament," p. 32).

We may fairly assume that Ignatius Loyola and John Bunyan, in their several stations, were for the first twenty or twenty-five years of their lives neither much better nor much worse than other young men amongst whom they lived. There was little on the surface to forebode the saint in either of them, except that strong and earnest cast of mind which seems the indispensable natural basis of high holiness. That Ignatius ultimately attained to high holiness, we have the word of the Church which canonized him. What the holiness of John Bunyan was worth in the sight of God every reader of his works may conjecture for himself and risk his own conclusions. *Oh, how good and sweet is thy Spirit,* the Wise Man says (Wisdom xii., 1).[3] To me the writings of John Bunyan have been and are more and more *as the odour of a field which the Lord hath blessed,* redolent of that goodness and sweetness, that unworldliness and love of Christ, that humility and horror of sin, which I take to mark the presence of the Spirit of God, even in the midst of much human infirmity and delusion. It is not easy for an Englishman, Catholic or Protestant, who understands Bunyan, to read him with dry eyes and without feeling his heart softened to impressions of grace. I think then I am not rash in speaking of John Bunyan's "conversion"

---

[2] In the "Spiritual Exercises" St. Ignatius is unusually prolix on swearing, as though the subject touched his conscience also. "That lock went *damnable* hard, yet the key did open it" (the iron gate of Giant Despair's Castle, "Pilgrim's Progress," I., 109) shows some reversion to Bunyan's earlier style.

as well as of the conversion of St. Ignatius. Poor John's conversion—for he was "as poor as a howlet," and "of a low and inconsiderable generation"—began in fear, more markedly so than that of the chivalrous Castilian nobleman. He was himself the *Pilgrim* at the opening of his *Progress*, crying, "What shall I do to be saved? I fear that this burden (of sins) that is upon my back will sink me lower than the grave, and I shall fall into Tophet;" and so he receives "a parchment roll, and there was written within, *Fly from the wrath to come.*"[4]

Neither conversion was sudden nor instantaneously complete. Both were gradual, had well-marked stages, and took months, even years, to accomplish. Is not this the case with all lasting conversions? To a careful reader of St. Augustine's "Confessions," the *tolle, lege* incident will hardly seem to make an exception. About the age of twenty-five Bunyan joined the Baptists, and was baptized by total immersion in the Ouse at Bedford. Knowing how carelessly baptism was often administered in the Church of England in those days, one would not be surprised if Bunyan really received the Sacrament of Baptism on that occasion, which thus would have been an epoch in his life, more than he appreciated, for he seems (with his Lutheran notions) to have had a poor appreciation of sacramental grace.[5] Shortly after, the greatest trouble of Bunyan's life overtook him. The remorse of his great sin, for so he considered it, for two years and a half kept him on the brink of despair.

> One morning, as I did lie in my bed, I was, as at other times, most fiercely assaulted with this temptation, to sell and part with Christ, the wicked suggestion still running in my mind, *Sell him, sell him, sell him, sell him, sell him,* as fast as a man could speak. Against which also, in my mind, as at other times, I answered, *No, no, not for thousands, thousands, thousands,* at least twenty times together. But at last, after much striving, even until I was almost out of breath, I felt this thought pass through my heart, *Let him go, if he will!* and I thought also that I felt my heart freely consent thereto. Oh, the diligence of Satan! Oh, the desperateness of man's heart! Now was the battle won, and down fell I, as a bird that is shot from the top of a tree, into great guilt and fearful despair. Thus getting out of my bed, I went moping into the field; but, God knows, with as heavy a heart as mortal man, I think, could bear; where, for the space of two hours, I was like a man bereft of life, and as now past all recovery and bound over to eternal punishment. And withal that Scripture did seize upon my soul (Heb. xii., 16, 17), *Or profane person as Esau, who for one morsel of meat sold his birthright, for ye know how that afterward, when he would have inherited the blessing, he was rejected, for he found no place for repentance, though he sought it carefully with tears.* . . . . And still, to aggravate my misery, that would run in my mind, *Ye know that afterward, when he would have inherited the blessing, he was rejected.* Oh! none knows the terrors of those days but myself.[6]

This example shows the benefit of confession, if not for *profane persons as Esau*—a man about as unlike John Bunyan as one man could be unlike another—at least for earnest minds and minds afraid

[3] "Pilgrim's Progress," Part II., p. 280; "Grace Abounding," note 2. [4] "Pilgrim's Progress," Part I., pp. 12, 13.

[5] But in "Pilgrim's Progress," Part II., p. 192, he describes very well the sanctification wrought by baptism, and the "seal" or "character" it confers. [6] "Grace Abounding," nn. 139 sq.

of moral evil. Had Bunyan been a Catholic, he would have confessed this matter, early or late, to one of those "Seminarists or Jesuits," who in those days went about in the hours between night and day. The Father from Valladolid or St. Omer would have spoken to his penitent in this wise: "You hated the sin all along, therefore you did not consent to it; it was a mere illusory consent, not your own genuine act as a man;[7] your mind was upset, you were not master of yourself; anyhow, you confess it as it is before God; and I give you absolution in His name; go in peace." There would have been the end of that chapter; it would not have lengthened out into a two years' agony.

Not that confession, well made, always gives this immediate and permanent peace of mind. In St. Ignatius' case it did not.

When he came to Montserrat, after much prayer, he made a written general confession of his sins with the confessor's consent, and spread it over three days. . . . . Yet now he sometimes imagined that he had omitted this thing or that, whereat he was not a little cast down. And when he would then confess it, yet the soul within him was never at rest. . . . . After confession the scruples returned again each day about smaller things than ever. He was in grievous torment about this, not being ignorant that scruples are exceedingly harmful and that he would be well rid of them; but he could not act on this and drive them away. . . . . His confessor told him not to confess anything more of his past sins, unless something plainly and manifestly sinful came to memory. But since he viewed them all as manifestly sinful, this order in nowise helped him, and he was left in perpetual misery.[8]

These scruples "sorely burdened him for many months." At last, after a great conflict, "he resolved with great clearness never again to mention the past in confession," and "was delivered from scruples from that day forth." He mentions scruples in his "Spiritual Exercises" as things of no little advantage to the soul, provided they only last for a time, in so far as they lead to the thorough cleansing of the conscience and remove a person from all appearance of sin. Confessors know that scrupulous people as a rule are innocent people. But scruples are malignant things when they become chronic. They can only be cured by unqualified commands (without *if* and *unless*) on the part of the confessor, and unqualified obedience on the part of the penitent. St. Ignatius describes a scruple thus: "There comes to me from without a thought that I have sinned, and on the other hand it seems to me that I have not sinned; and thereupon I feel troubled, inasmuch as I doubt and inas-

[7] By the time he came to write "Pilgrim's Progress," Bunyan had found this out for himself: "Now poor Christian was so confounded that he did not know his own voice. Just when he was come over against the mouth of the burning pit, one of the wicked ones got behind him, and stept up softly to him, and whisperingly suggested many grievous blasphemies to him, which he verily thought had proceeded out of his own mind. This put Christian more to it than anything he had met with before, even to think that he should now blaspheme him that he loved so much before; yet could he have helped it, he would not have done it; but he had not the discretion neither to stop his ears, nor to know from whence those blasphemies came." "Pilgrim's Progress," Part I., page 60. [8] "Testament," pp. 69, 75, 83.

much as I do not doubt"—a fluctuation of mind answering exactly to Hamlet's "such gain-giving as might perhaps trouble a woman." Bunyan seems never to have doubted but that his passing thought was a sin most deadly and grievous; and, supposing him to have been in error there, he was not the victim of a "scruple" in the Ignatian sense, but of "an erroneous judgment," or a mistake in moral theology, which error of judgment, St. Ignatius says, is "to be entirely abhorred."

Bunyan's subsequent vicissitudes of mind as to whether he had or had not committed the unforgiven sin, were more like St. Ignatius' scruples. Bunyan was driven to and fro by texts of Scripture borne in upon him, favorable or unfavorable to his chances of forgiveness. St. Ignatius had the direction of his confessor and a speedier deliverance.

We find in the "Spiritual Exercises" certain "Rules for feeling and knowing in some sort the various movements that are excited in the soul; the good ones, that they may be taken up; the bad ones, that they may be rejected. The most important of these is the second:

> In those who are earnestly engaged on the purification of their soul from sin, and who keep trying to mount from good to better in the service of God our Lord, ... it is proper to the evil spirit to sting and sadden and raise difficulties, rendering the soul restless by false reckonings, that it may not advance any further. And it is proper to the good spirit to give courage and strength, consolations, tears, inspirations and rest, making things easy and removing all difficulties, that the soul may go on further in doing good.

The reader of "Grace Abounding" will readily believe that the hero of this piece of autobiography was one earnestly engaged in the purification of his soul from sin," according to such lights as were vouchsafed to a poor Baptist tinker-man in seventeenth century England. Would that we Catholics were always as much in earnest! There is every reason to give honest John the benefit of the Ignatian rule; and to see the special providence of the Holy Spirit in the occurrence of Scripture texts to his mind, which lit up his darkness for a while, and ultimately chased the shades entirely away. This is a specimen:

> I said to myself with a grievous sigh, How can God comfort such a wretch as I? I had no sooner said it but this returned upon me, as an echo doth answer a voice, *This sin is not unto death* [cf. John xi., 4]. At which I was as if I had been raised out of a grave, and cried out again, Lord, how couldst thou find out such a word as this? For I was filled with admiration at the fitness and also at the unexpectedness of the sentence. The fitness of the word, the rightness of the timing of it, the power and sweetness and light and glory that came with it also, was marvelous for me to find. I was now, for the time, out of doubt as to that about which I so much was in doubt before. My fears before were that my sin was not pardonable, and so that I had no right to pray. . . . . This, therefore, was a great easement to my mind, to wit, that my sin was pardonable, that it was not the sin unto death (I. John v., 16, 17). . . . . I seemed now to stand upon the same ground with other sinners, and to have as good a right to the Word and prayer as any of them.[9]

[9] "Grace Abounding," note 188.

On this, and on many other occasions, Bunyan got what St. Ignatius in the "Exercises" calls "an inward sense" of application of a Scripture text to his soul. These "inward senses" come from God.[10] On the other hand, the devil, as Bunyan says, quoted many Scripture texts, such as that about Esau, and perversely applied them to vex and harrow him.

The following parallelism has always seemed to me very curious:

St. Ignatius "Spiritual Exercises," ex. 2, p. 5	Bunyan "Grace Abounding," note 187.
A cry of wonder, with mighty emotion, discoursing through all creatures, how they have suffered me to live and have preserved me in life; how the Angels, being as they are the sword of divine justice, have supported me, and guarded me, and prayed for me; how the Saints have gone the length of interceding and praying for me; and so of heavens, sun, moon, stars and elements, fruits, birds, fishes and animals; and how the earth has not opened to swallow me up, creating new hells, that I might be tormented in them for ever.	So one day I walked to a neighboring town, and sat down upon a settle in the street and fell into a very deep pause about the most fearful state my sin had brought me to; and after long musing I lifted up my head, but methought I saw as if the sun that shineth in the heavens did grudge to give me light, and as if the very stones in the street and tiles upon the houses did bend themselves against me: methought that they all combined together to banish me out of the world; I was abhorred of them, and unfit to dwell among them, because I had sinned against the Saviour.

I am convinced that both men under these emotions were influenced by the Spirit of God, the spirit of humility and a contrite heart. One sign thereof is that they were not left to despair. St. Ignatius "concludes with a colloquy of mercy;" and Bunyan immediately after conceived hopes of pardon, and recognized that "this sin is not unto death."

Bunyan's faith took a true hold of the doctrine of the Incarnation, and abhorred the Quakerism of his day for denying it.[11] There is no more marked characteristic of the author of the "Spiritual Exercises" and founder of the Society or Company of Jesus, than his passionate love for the person of Jesus Christ. There is much in Bunyan to remind us of Ignatius here. The following is no bad illustration of the second, third and fourth "weeks," as they are called, of the "Spiritual Exercises:"

Methought I was as if I had seen Him born, as if I had seen Him grow up, as if I had seen him walk through this world from the cradle to His cross; to which also when He came I saw how gently He gave Himself to be hanged and nailed for my sins and wicked doings. . . . . I have seen as if He leaped at the grave's mouth for joy that He was risen again and had got the conquest over our dreadful foes. I have also in the spirit seen Him a Man on the right hand of God the Father for me, and have seen the manner of His coming from heaven to judge the world with glory. . . . . Now, could I . . . . often long and desire that the last day were come, that I might for ever be inflamed with the sight and joy and communion with Him whose head was crowned with thorns, whose face was spit on, and body broken, and soul made an offering for my sins. For whereas before I lay continually trembling at the mouth of hell, now methought I was got so far therefrom that I could not, when I looked back, scarce discern it; and oh! thought I, that I were fourscore years old now, that I might die quickly, that my soul might be gone to rest.[12]

[10] "Spiritual Exercises," Rules for the further discernment of spirits, note 2. [11] "Grace Abounding," notes 122, 124. [12] Ibid, notes 120, 121, 128.

Bunyan then was himself his own Mr. Standfast, speaking his last words, half way in the River of Death.

I see myself now at the end of my journey; my toilsome days are ended; I am going now to see that Head that was crowned with thorns and that Face that was spat upon for me. I have formerly lived by hearsay and faith, but now I go where I shall live by sight, and shall be with Him in whose company I delight myself. I have loved to hear my Lord spoken of; and wherever I have seen the print of His shoe upon the earth, there I have coveted to set my foot, too.[13] His name has been to me as a civet-box, yea, sweeter than all perfumes. His voice to me has been most sweet; and His countenance I have more desired than they that desire the light of the sun. His word I did use to gather for my food, and for antidotes against my faintings.[14].

Such words as the following, written by Bunyan, might have stood in an autobiography of St. Ignatius:

Then I began to give place to the Word which with power did over and over make this joyful sound within my soul: *Thou art my Love, thou art my Love, and nothing shall separate thee* (qu. *me*) *from my love;* and with that Romans viii., 39, came into my mind. Now was my heart filled full of comfort and hope, and now I could believe that my sins should be forgiven me; yea, I was now so taken with the love and mercy of God that I remember I could not tell how to contain till I got home. I thought I could have spoken of His love and of His mercy to me even to the very crows that sat upon the ploughed lands before me, had they been capable to have understood me.[15]

In the last years of his life Bunyan had a great following. But unlike St. Ignatius, he founded no permanent society. He was not fit to do that. The way that he trod to heaven was, so to speak, an unscientific way, lit by the light of a defective theology, not fenced in by the securities of church ordinances, a dangerous way like the path of his own Christian through the Valley of the Shadow of Death. It was much if Bunyan saved his own soul, taking such a road. He organized no society, but he wrote a great book. The "Pilgrim's Progress" has done among Protestants something of the work of the "Spiritual Exercises" amongst Catholics. After the Bible, perhaps no book has done so much good as the classic production which Bunyan's genius flung with such hesitation upon the world.

Some said, *John, print it;* others said, *Not so.*
Some said, *It might do good;* others said, *No.*

Bunyan was no poet. I fear a severe censor, had the author submitted his MS. to censorship, would have excised all the verses, and

[13] An overpowering longing possessed him to ascend the Mount of Olives once again before his departure. . . . . The stone from which our Lord went up into heaven is on that mountain, wherein His footprints may be yet discerned, and this it was he so desired to see. Now the ascent is perilous to any one unaccompanied by a Turkish guide; notwithstanding, he withdrew himself and repaired alone to the Mount of Olives, warning no one and taking no guide; and when the keepers denied him entrance, he took a penknife from his writing-case and gave it them. He made his prayer, and was comforted, and afterwards conceived the design of going to Bethphage. When he was there, he thought he had not sufficiently noted on Mount Olivet the precise place [bearings, east or west] of the right foot and of the left. I think he gave the scissors he used to carry to the keepers when he came back again, that he might be allowed to reënter. "Testament of St. Ignatius," pp. 113, 114. It strikes a reader of Bunyan how in this "Testament" from page 67 onwards St. Ignatius is always spoken of as "the Pilgrim." [14] "Pilgrim's Progress," Part II., page 290. [15] "Grace Abounding," note 92.

some little of the prose, chiefly of the conversations. But part of the charm of the book is a rusticity, of which these are the excesses. There are, however, two lyrical gems in the "Pilgrim's Progress," Part II., namely, the Song of the Shepherd Boy in the Valley of Humiliation, and what we may call the Pilgrim Song of Mr. Valiant-for-Truth. The latest Oxford editor doubts whether Bunyan could have written them himself. But is not any man of earnest feeling, who makes many attempts, apt to succeed at times in some fugitive piece of poetry? Till these lyrics can be identified in some earlier work, John Bunyan must have the credit of them.

THE SHEPHERD BOY'S SONG.

He that is down, needs fear no fall;
  He that is low, no pride:
He that is humble, ever shall
  Have God to be his guide.
I am content with what I have,
  Little be it, or much;
And, Lord, contentment still I crave,
  Because Thou savest such.
Fulness to such a burden is
  That go on pilgrimage;
Here little, and hereafter bliss,
  Is best from age to age.

THE PILGRIM SONG.

Who would true valour see,
  Let him come hither;
One here will constant be,
  Come wind, come weather.
There's no discouragement
Shall make him once relent
His first avowed intent,
To be a Pilgrim.
Whosoe beset him round
  With dismal stories,
Do but themselves confound:
  His strength the more is.
No lion can him fright,
He'll with a giant fight,
But he will have a right,
To be a Pilgrim.
Hobgoblin nor foul fiend
  Can daunt his spirit;
He knows, he at the end
  Shall life inherit.
Then, fancies, fly away,
He'll fear not what men say;
He'll labor night and day,
To be a Pilgrim.

I will here complete what I have to say of the parallelism, such as it is, between the "Pilgrim's Progress" and the "Spiritual Exercises." The "exercitant," as he is called, or the person making the Spiritual Exercises, particularly if he be a person just awakening from a state of sin, could not begin in better dispositions than in those of Bunyan's Christian, crying aloud: "Life, life, eternal life;" fleeing from the wrath to come, and fearing lest he sink lower than the grave into a place burning with fire and brimstone. Christian

in the first part of "Pilgrim's Progress" is Bunyan himself making his own way through spiritual difficulties; in the second part of the "Progress" Mr. Greatheart is Bunyan, now become a guide to souls. Here then is Mr. Greatheart's wisdom:

> And for my part I care not at all for that profession [of piety] that begins not in heaviness of mind. The first string that the musicians usually touches is the bass, when he intends to put all in tune. God also plays upon this string first, when He sets the soul in tune for Himself. Only here was the imperfection of Mr. Fearing, he could play upon no other music than this till towards his bitter end. . . . . No fears, no grace, said James. "Pilgrim's Progress," Part II., pages 235-6.

Only this must not be a desponding fear. It must be a fear tempered with hope of pardon. St. Ignatius tells the exercitant, however sinful he may be: "It is of great advantage for him who receives the Exercises to enter upon them with great courage and generosity towards his Creator and Lord" (annot. 5). He is to end the meditation on Hell, thanking God for not having allowed him to find a place there, and for always having dealt with him with so much mercy and affection. Otherwise the exercitant is engulfed in Bunyan's *Slough of Despond.*

> This miry slough . . . . is the descent whither the scum and filth that attends conviction for sin doth continually run, and therefore it is called the *Slough of Despond;* for still as the sinner is awakened about his lost condition, there ariseth in his soul many fears and doubts and discouraging apprehensions, which all of them get together and settle in this place.

Few have made the Exercises, or helped others to make them, to any good purpose, without experience of the Slough of Despond. A preliminary wallow there, as in Christian's case, provided one come out, as he did, on the right side, and with set purpose to go on, is a happy omen for the journey.

The very name of "Pilgrim's Progress," recalling as it does those texts, I. Peter ii., 11, Hebrews xi., 13, about being strangers and pilgrims in this world, seeking a better country, contains the idea of that indifference, or detachment, which from first to last is the guiding principle of the Spiritual Exercises—"to make ourselves detached from all worldly things, . . . so as not to wish on our side for riches—riches rather than poverty—solely desiring and choosing those means that are better apt to lead us to the end for which we were created." This is John Bunyan and his Pilgrim all over, the leading feature of his character, his thorough unworldliness and regard fixed on heaven for himself and his fellow man. This it is that makes his writings so tender, so moving, so persuasive. Are we ever moved except by unselfish earnestness?

Some of the most imaginative of mankind live in the midst of the most romantic scenery. John Bunyan's imagination throve amid the "puddles and horse-pads" of Bedfordshire. It was fed, not on

his homely surroundings, but on the imagery of the Bible. Thus he produced a work that contests with the "Faery Queene" the praise of being the greatest allegory in our language. In the "Spiritual Exercises" also imagination plays a great part. At the beginning of every meditation the exercitant is to "look with the eyes of the imagination." One special form of meditation, or contemplation, prescribed is an imaginative use of the senses. To one who knows the "Exercises," the names "Kingdom of Christ," "Incarnation," "Two Standards" are enough. I remember how they stirred the imagination of a boy still in his teens, when he went through those meditations for the first time according to the Ignatian model. But the imagery of the "Exercises," it must be confessed, is not so much based on the Bible—in the text of which Bunyan could have stood a much better examination than Ignatius—but rather on what the chivalrous author had seen in camps and in the houses of the great. Take imagination away, and the bloom is gone off "Pilgrim's Progress" and off the "Spiritual Exercises." Neither the one nor the other is a mere reasoned treatise, though there is sound work of reason and shrewd judgment in both. In the contemplation of the Incarnation St. Ignatius would have us not confine ourselves to the angelic salutation and the limits of Mary's house at Nazareth, but to perambulate the round of the earth, as the angels do in Zachary's prophecy, and observe anew "some white, some black; some in peace, and others at war; some weeping, and others laughing; some in health, and others in sickness; some new-born infants, and others dying." He wishes us to know the world and its miseries, into which Christ comes as Saviour. The pages of "Pilgrim's Progress," descriptive of "Vanity Fair," would be helpful reading for any one making this contemplation.[16]

Now, as I said, the way to the Celestial City lies just through this town, where this lusty Fair is kept; and he that will go to the City, and yet will not go through this town, must needs go out of the world (I. Cor. v., 10). The Prince of Princes Himself, when here, went through this town to His own country, and that upon a Fair-day, too. Yea, and as I think, it was Beelzebub, the chief lord of this Fair, that invited Him to buy of his vanities; yea, would have made Him lord of the Fair, would He but have done him reverence as He went through the town (Matt. iv., 8, 9). Yea, because He was such a person of honour, Beelzebub had Him from street to street, and showed Him all the kingdoms of the world in a little time, that he might, if possible, allure that Blessed One to cheapen [chaffer or bargain for] and buy some of his vanities. But He had no mind to the merchandise, and therefore left the town without laying out so much as one farthing upon these vanities. This Fair, therefore, is an ancient thing, of long standing, and a very great Fair.

The spirit of this "very great Fair" is personified in Madam Bubble, who tempts Mr. Standfast on the Enchanted Ground.[17] Very Ignatian is the description of her, read in the light of his "Two Standards:"

Doth she not wear a great purse by her side, and is not her hand often in it,

[16] "Pilgrim's Progress," Part I., pages 82-84. [17] Ibid, Part II., page 281.

fingering her money, as if that was her heart's delight? . . . . She always laugheth poor pilgrims to scorn, but highly commends the rich. If there be one cunning to get money in a place, she will speak well of him from house to house. . . . . She loves to be sought after, spoken well of and to lie in the bosoms of men. She is never weary of commending her commodities, and she loves them most that think best of her. She will promise to some crowns and kingdoms, if they will but take her advice. Yet many has she brought to the halter, and ten thousand times more to hell.

The whole description, written in some antithesis to Proverbs xxxi., *who hath found a valiant woman?* etc., is one of the most splendid in Bunyan. Madame Bubble is the impersonation of that "world," with its "worldly and vain things," which in the colloquy of his Third Exercise St. Ignatius prays to "know, abhor and put away."

Byends, with his friends Mr. Money-love and Mr. Hold-the-world, and his immortal kinsman, Mr. Facing-bothways,[18] has much that reminds us of St. Ignatius' "Second Firm," the Firm that "wants to take away all affection for wealth, but to hold by the cash for all that, meaning God to come over to their standpoint, and having no heart or resolution to abandon their property and so pass over to God, even though that step were the best for them."

In the "Prelude to Election" Ignatius warns us against Byends: "In every good election, . . . the eye of our intention should be simple, solely considering the end for which I am created; . . . wherefore whatever I choose should be in view of this, to help me to the end for which I am created, not directing nor dragging the end to meet the means, but the means to meet the end."

The perfection aimed at by the "Spiritual Exercises" is summed up in what the author calls the *Third Mark of Humility*, namely, the positive desire of humiliations in order to be like Christ, laden with them. Bunyan takes Christian through the *Valley of Humiliations*, but without a word of praise for it; it is made the scene of an ugly encounter.[19] But in the Second Part he tries to find excuses for this oversight. The Valley now appears as "the best and most fruitful ground in all those parts;" "a valley that nobody walks in but those that love a Pilgrim's life." Mercy says of it: "The place methinks suits with my spirit;" and Greatheart, the guide, declares: "I have gone through this Valley many a time, and never was better than when here."[20]

Christian and Hopeful, after they have passed the Delectable Mountains and are nearing the Celestial City, become doubtful of their way. Forthwith "behold a man black of flesh, but covered with a very light robe, came to them and asked them why they stood

[18] "Pilgrim's Progress," Part I., pages 92-100. [19] Faithful, however, fared better in it, and speaks well of the Valley. "Pilgrim's Progress," Part I., pages 67, 68. [20] "Pilgrim's Progress," Part II., pages 220-222. This was Bunyan's own experience. "Grace Abounding," notes 304-312.

there. They answered, they were going to the Celestial City, but knew not which of these ways to take. Follow me, said the man; it is thither that I am going." But he led them round away from the City, and in the end caught them helpless in a net; "and with that, the white robe fell off the black man's back." From this predicament they are rescued by an angel, who scourges them for their forgetfulness of the warning that had been given them to "beware of the Flatterer." St. Ignatius gives certain rules for proficients, for men who have been on the Delectable Mountains of prayer, have had some glimpse from thence of the Heavenly City night at hand, and would reject any temptation to gross evil. These Rules are so many cautions against the Flatterer. The fourth Rule runs thus:

It is proper to the evil angel, who transforms himself into an angel of light, to come in following the lead of the devout soul, and go out taking his own lead; that is, to induce good and holy thoughts conformable to the just soul, and then gradually he manages to arrive at his own end, dragging the soul into his secret frauds and perverse purposes.

This is just the story of the black man, the white robe and the net.[21] On the other hand, Christian and Hopeful spurn at once the Atheist, who next confronts them and avers point-blank that there is no such place as the Celestial City. That would be styled in the language of the "Exercises," "a temptation of the first week." But it is remarkable that neither in the "Exercises" nor in the "Testament of St. Ignatius" is there any mention of temptations against faith. The fervid Spanish faith of the author seems never to have known difficulty. Almost the only mention of faith is a caution at the end of the "Exercises," "lest by much earnest talk of faith occasion be given to the common people of growing slack in works," a caution hardly needed to-day in addressing a cultured English audience. Bunyan's faith, going solitary without the guidance of the Church, was often sorely tried.[22] He has left a vivid description of the doom of the Apostate.

They entered into a very dark lane, where they met a man whom seven devils had bound with seven strong cords, and were carrying of him back to the door that they saw in the side of the hill (the by-way to hell). . . . . Christian looked to see if he knew him, and he thought it might be one Turn-away that dwelt in the town of Apostasy. But he did not perfectly see his face, for he did hang his head like a thief that is found. But being gone past, Hopeful looked after him, and espied on his back a paper with this inscription: *Wanton Professor and damnable Apostate.*[23]

Further particulars are added in the Second Part:

He would hearken to no counsel, but once a-falling, persuasion could not stop him. When he came to the place where the Cross and the Sepulchre was he did meet with one that did bid him look there; but he gnashed with his teeth, and stamped, and said he was resolved to go back to his own town.[24]

---

[21] "Pilgrim's Progress," Part I., page 122. [22] "Grace Abounding," notes 97-100, 244, and the conclusion, notes 1, 6. [23] "Pilgrim's Progress," Part I., page 115. [24] "Pilgrim's Progress," Part II., page 269.

To convert an unbeliever, I should not ply him with controversy; I could not expect him to go through the "Spiritual Exercises;" and I might find him too prejudiced to read with an even mind our modern Catholic books of instruction. But I should be glad to see in his hands, and believe that he was reading attentively, "Pilgrim's Progress" with "Grace Abounding" for a key to it, the "Imitation of Christ" and the Four Gospels. Not that I put these books on a level, but by the Aristotelian rule of progress, *ex minus perfecto ad perfectum.*

A man may go on repeating formularies, learnt in childhood, and still in part believe them, all the while that his mind has developed quite upon other principles, so that those formularies come to be in logical contradiction with most of what he thinks, and his conduct gives them the lie. This may happen alike with orthodox and with heretical formularies. A man may make profession of the Catholic faith, and in heart never have renounced it; and still the mass of his opinions may be uncatholic, and his utterances make the children of the faith grieve. Another man may have been nurtured in heresy, and habitually talk heresy, and have some admixture of heresy in his beliefs, and yet in the main have burst the bonds of heretical perversity, and be feeding his soul and building his life upon the true sense of the Gospel.

In this manner I should call Bunyan a Lutheran, but an emancipated Lutheran. In his own homely comparison, he was like "some of the birds that are of the brisker sort, who will run to and fro in trodden paths with the shell [of Lutheranism] upon their heads."[25] Bunyan avoided controversy, and formed two religious views upon his own spiritual experiences of the Bible.[26] The one other book to which he confesses himself indebted is Luther's Commentary on the Galatians, which he preferred, he says, "excepting the Holy Bible, before all the books that I have ever seen, as most fit for a wounded conscience."[27] *To them who love God all things work together unto good,* says St. Paul (Romans viii., 28). An elect soul may get a turn heavenwards from an heresiarch, accidentally, where better aid is lacking. So went Bunyan from Luther to his Saviour.

> And now I found, as I thought, that I loved Christ dearly. Oh! me thought my soul cleaved unto Him, my affections cleaved unto Him. I felt love to Him as hot as fire.[28]

This consolation was well enough while it lasted. But it is quite likely that the unwholesome teaching of Luther about temptations to blasphemy sowed the seeds of that heavy trouble which presently made John Bunyan's life a torment to him for upwards of two years.[29]

---

[25] "Pilgrim's Progress," Part I., page 118. [26] "Grace Abounding," notes 284, 285. [27] Ibid, notes 129, 130. [28] Ibid, note 131. [29] Ibid, note 132 sq

Hopeful's conversion[30] is Bunyan's own conversion, as told in "Grace Abounding" (nn. 8-10, 30-32, 77-114). The steps were these: first a free indulgence in sin, then remorse and alarm, then reformation of conduct, then a feeling that, for all the good works that were now being done, past sin remained unatoned for. All these steps so far are in accordance with the theology of the Catholic Church. Let us hear Hopeful himself:

> My trouble came trembling upon me again, and that over the neck of all my reformations. . . . . I further thought thus: If a man runs a hundred pound into the shopkeeper's debt, and after that shall pay for all that he shall fetch, yet his old debt stands still in the book uncrossed, for the which the shopkeeper may sue him and cast him into prison until he shall pay the debt. . . . . I have by my sins run a great way into God's book, and my now reforming will not pay off that score; therefore I should still think under all my present amendments: "But how shall I be freed from that damnation that I have brought myself in danger of by my former transgressions?"

This reasoning is excellent, and the sentiment thoroughly Catholic. A new life is no sufficient atonement for a bad past. Nor can any good works that a sinner can do avail to justify him, or merit his justification and forgiveness. On the other hand, it is too much to say that all the works of a sinner are sinful, or mixed with (actual) sin. This language in Hopeful's mouth is an exaggeration: "I still see sin, new sin, mixing itself with the best of that I do: . . . I have committed sin enough in one duty to send me to hell."

Again, it is an exaggeration that Christian utters to Ignorance: "(Good thoughts concerning God are) when we think that all our righteousness stinks in His nostrils, and that therefore He cannot abide to see us stand before Him in any confidence even of our best performances."

Even before justification a sinner may do acts that are good and blameless, as the Council of Trent lays down: "If any one says that all works done before justification, however they are done, are truly sins, or deserve the hatred of God, let him be anathema."[31] Still less is Bunyan's language true if he meant it to extend to good works done after justification, such works being truly acceptable to God and meritorious of reward in heaven.[32]

On the actual process of justification Bunyan is neither a thorough-paced Lutheran nor an accurate Tridentine. He frequently uses Lutheran phrases, as when he speaks the soul "being shrouded under the skirt of Christ's righteousness, and by it presented as spotless before God."[33] He looks for a revelation of Christ from heaven to every sinner that is justified;[34] and always assumes that sin is

[30] "Pilgrim's Progress," Part I., pages 126-136. From a literary standpoint this is the least pleasing passage in "Pilgrim's Progress." The behavior of Hopeful and Christian to poor Ignorance is that of the Pharisee to the Publican. [31] Sess. 6, can. 7. [32] Sess. 6, capp. 11, 16, and can. 25. [33] "Pilgrim's Progress," Part I., page 135. [34] "Ask him if ever he had Christ revealed to him from heaven?" is the question that Hopeful would have put to Ignorance. "Pilgrim's Progress," Part I., page 135.

never forgiven without the sinner receiving any inward assurance of pardon—or what St. Ignatius would call "consolation." On the other hand, he never says that this inward assurance is the formal justification of the sinner. From the antinomianism, which is the worst evil of Lutheranism, whether taught by Luther himself or an abuse of Luther's teaching, Bunyan, as I shall show, is quite free.[35] The sensible assurance that Bunyan sought as a mark of justification seems never to have been assurance of the future, but of the past; not a "sure and certain hope of salvation," as though sin had become henceforth an impossibility, but a confidence in the forgiveness of all past sin, such as a Catholic might derive from sacramental absolution received. He frequently refers to the possibility of Pilgrims falling away and being lost forever, even after they have reached the Delectable Mountains, or got beyond them to the frontiers of the Land of Beulah.[36] Bunyan was never able to find any such assurance of the future for himself. He lived all his life in fear and trembling, and taught other men to do likewise. It was after thinking that he had an evidence of his salvation from heaven, "with many golden seals thereon, all hanging in his sight," that he came to commit what he considered his fearful sin of consenting to sell Christ.[37]

Thus Bunyan was not beguiled by what the Council of Trent calls "the vain confidence of heretics," that, once they felt justified, they were justified by feeling so, and could never fall away; or, in other words, once in grace, always in grace.[38] The dying speech of Bunyan's great contemporary recurs in this connection. He asked a divine at his bedside whether it was possible to fall from grace. The divine answering in the negative, Cromwell said: "Then I am safe, for I was in grace once." Bunyan, I think, would have answered otherwise. He represents Christian as losing his "roll" or baptismal token, that entitled him to entrance at the Celestial Gate, and having to go back to recover it.[39] He says, much as St. Ignatius does, that "fear tends much to men's good and to make them right, at their beginning to go on pilgrimage; . . . it begetteth and continueth in the soul a great reverence of God, His word and ways, keeping it tender and making it afraid to turn from them to the right hand or to the left."[40]

The Council of Trent (Sess. 6, Cap. 6) describes thus the steps of

---

[35] Christian waxes wroth with Ignorance, who charges him with it. "Pilgrim's Progress," Part I., page 135. [36] "Pilgrim's Progress," Part I., page 112; Part II., pages 239, 278, 280. [37] "Grace Abounding," notes 128, 139. [38] Trent. Sess. 6, capp. 9, 13, and can. 14. [39] "Pilgrim's Progress," Part I., pages 41, 42; cf. the story of "one Temporary." "Pilgrim's Progress," Part I., pages 138, 139. [40] "Pilgrim's Progress," Part I., page 137. Cf. "Grace Abounding," note 82, "Oh, how gingerly did I then go in all I did or said!" Bunyan is represented by his own Mr. Fearing. "Pilgrim's Progress," Part II., pages 232-235.

the justification of a sinner. First he has faith in the revealed word of God; then a sense of his sin; then he conceives hope of pardon through Christ; then he has some commencement of charity, or love of God; so he has a hatred of sin, and purposes to receive baptism [or penance, if he is already baptized]. I do not suppose that Bunyan ever read a line of the Council of Trent; yet who knows? As Father Thurston has shown, there was a great circulation of Catholic books of piety among non-Catholics in England in the seventeenth century. This, however, is Bunyan's account of justification:

A work of grace in the soul discovereth itself . . . . to him that hath it, thus. It gives him conviction of sin, especially of the defilement of his nature and the sin of unbelief, for the sake of which he is sure to be damned, if he findeth not mercy at God's hand by faith in Jesus Christ. This sight and sense of things worketh in him sorrow and shame for sin; he findeth, moreover, revealed in him the Saviour of the world, and the absolute necessity of closing with Him for life; after which he finds the hungerings and thirstings after Him, to the which hungerings the promise is made (Matt. v., 6; Rev. xxi., 6). Now, according to the strength or weakness of his faith in his Saviour, so is his joy and peace, so is his love to holiness, so are his desires to know Him more, and also to serve Him in this world.[41]

These two accounts are neither identical nor wholly dissimilar. Bunyan goes on very well to observe that the sinner is not to rely too much on these signs of conversion, "because his abused reason makes his mind to misjudge in this matter." Further evidence is requisite, and especially "a life answering to that confession, to wit, a life of holiness, heart-holiness, family-holiness (if he hath a family) and conversation-holiness in the world, which in the general teacheth him inwardly to abhor his sin, and himself for that in secret, to suppress it in his family, and to promote holiness in the world, not by talk only, as a hypocrite or talkative person may do, but by a practical subjection in faith and love to the power of the word."[42] Hence Old Honest and Mr. Great-heart loudly condemn Mr. Self-will, who holds himself free to copy every proceeding, good or bad, of the "Pilgrims" that were under the Old Law, on which Great-heart's comment is: "A very wicked answer, for though to let loose the bridle to lusts, while our opinions are against such things, is bad, yet to sin and plead a toleration so to do is worse."[43] In Mr. Self-will we discover the Ranters, who tempted Bunyan in his youth.

These would also talk to me of their ways, and condemn me as legal and dark, pretending that they only had attained to perfection that could do as they would and not sin. . . . . But God, who had, as I hope, designed me for better things, kept me in the fear of His name, and did not suffer me to accept such cursed principles.[44]

---

[41] "Pilgrim's Progress," Part I., page 137. [42] "Pilgrim's Progress," Part I., page 78. Cf. Trent. sess. 6, cap. 11. [43] Ibid, Part II., pages 237, 238. [44] "Grace Abounding," note 45. Bunyan stood firm for the Creed against the Quakers ("Grace Abounding," notes 123, 124), and for the Commandments against the Ranters. Bunyan's contemporary, the Quietist Michael de Molinos, condemned by Innocent XI. in 1687, was scarcely less antinomian than the Ranters.

Hence Mr. Legality and his son Civility, who dwelt in the village named Morality, are pronounced cheats and hypocrites, not as though Bunyan wished to do away with the observance of the Mosaic moral law, or with the decencies of society, or with worldly wisdom either, but because they undertook more than they were able, in undertaking to rid Christian of his burden of sin.[45] The violation of the commandments is not atoned for by subsequent observance of the same; morality without grace gives no passport to heaven; this is the teaching not of John Bunyan only, but of St. Augustine against the Pelagians, and of the Councils of Trent and the Vatican.

To come now to the essence of justification, as the doctrine thereof is laid down by the Council of Trent (Sess. 6, Cap. 7) against Luther. Justification is "a sanctification and renovation of the inward man by the voluntary acceptance of grace and gifts." "The sole formal cause of justification," *i. e.*, that in which justification precisely consists, "is the justice of God, not that whereby He Himself is just, but that whereby He makes us just." We are described as "receiving justice in ourselves." "The charity of God is spread abroad in the hearts of them that are justified, and inheres in them." Thus for the Council. Turning to Bunyan, in a passage of remarkable beauty in "Grace Abounding" (nn. 255-259), the first thing to observe is the author's proneness to take "spiritual consolation," as the saints call it, for justification, and "spiritual desolation" for an evidence of sin; also his lack of discernment between mortal and venial sin. Being threatened with consumption, and finding in his daily life failings which a Catholic theologian would have told him were not more than venial sins, he says:

> Now was I sick in my inward man, my soul was clogged with guilt; now also was my former experience of God's goodness to me quite taken out of my mind, and hid as if it had never been nor seen. . . . . Now I sunk and fell in my spirit, and was giving up all for lost; but as I was walking up and down in the house as a man in a most woeful state, that word of God took hold of my heart, *Ye are justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus* (Rom. iii., 24). But oh, what a turn it made upon me! Now was I as one awakened out of some troublesome sleep and dream, and listening to this heavenly sentence, I was as if I heard it thus expounded to me: Sinner, thou thinkest that because of thy sins and infirmities I cannot save thy soul; but behold My Son is by Me, and upon Him I look, not on thee, and will deal with thee according as I am pleased with Him. At this I was greatly lightened in my mind, and made to understand that God could justify a sinner at any time; it was but His looking upon Christ and imputing His benefits to us, and the work was forthwith done.

This passage is:

a. Not Lutheran, but Tridentine and Catholic, in so far as it argues the gratuitousness of the justification of a sinner previously not in the state of gace.

b. Lutheran, or anyhow heretical, in so far as it may be taken to

[45] "Pilgrim's Progress," Part I., page 20 sq.

argue any license granted to the sinner to continue clogging his soul with wilful sins and voluntary infirmities; but to all such antinomianism and breach of the commandments Bunyan, as we have seen, was utterly averse, and this is not his meaning.

c. Lutheran, in so far as it argues mere imputation of the merits of Christ, without any inward change wrought by grace in the soul, or any inherent sanctification and justice.

From this Lutheranism Bunyan cannot be altogether cleared. In an elaborate and curious passage,[46] he distinguishes three righteousnesses in Jesus Christ, His righteousness as God, His righteousness as Man, His righteousness as God and Man together; and shows that with none of these three righteousnesses can Christ part. But he discovers a fourth righteousness in Christ, and this he says Christ gives to us, as the man who has two coats, one for himself and one to spare, gives away the spare coat to the first beggar he meets.

> He has therefore another righteousness, which standeth in performance, or obedience to a revealed will; and that is it that He puts upon sinners, and that by which their sins are covered.

The plain truth, here fancifully expressed, is that not by the fact of Christ being God are we redeemed, nor by the fact of His being Man, nor by the fact of His being God and Man together in one Person, but by the fact of His obedience even to the death of the cross. The merit of this obedience, however, Christ does not part with in making it available for us. By His obedience He merited at once His own exaltation, as St. Paul says (Philip ii., 8-9) and our salvation. And this our salvation and sanctification is a gift within us, even while we are on earth, not a something falsely imputed to us, but really belonging solely to Christ and inherent only in Him, which was the heresy and absurdity of Luther.[47] This revealed truth, of justice and sanctity coming to be inherent in the sinner when his sin is forgiven, Bunyan at times seems to recognize. Thus the interpreter speaks of the soul being "made clean, . . . and consequently fit for the King of Glory to inhabit."[48] When Christian's burden of sins rolled off his back, a "shining one," or angel, "stript him of his rags and clothed him with change of raiment."[49] In the house of the Interpreter, Christian's wife and children are

[46] "Pilgrim's Progress," Part II., pages 194, 195. [47] Even Luther could scarcely have gone so far as to say that the Blessed in heaven were still in their sin, only that God dissembled and regarded not their sinful state, but the face of His Christ. Then inherent sanctity is no impossibility in the justified soul. If found in heaven, why not on earth? The Church on earth is the vestibule of heaven. Luther confounds what we should have been but for Christ's redemption, namely, *still in our sins* (I. Cor. xv., 17), with what we are by Christ's redemption, *holy and blameless in his sight in charity* (Eph. i., 4). [48] "Pilgrim's Progress," Part I., page 30. [49] Ibid, Part I., page 37; cf. 39.

washed in "the bath of sanctification," and come out "sweet and clean," "fair as the moon."

> Then he (the Interpreter) called for the seal, wherewith they used to be sealed that were washed in his bath. So the seal was brought, and he set his mark upon them, ... and the mark was set between their eyes. This seal added greatly to their beauty, for it was an ornament to their faces. It also added to their gravity, and made their countenances more like them of angels. Then said the Interpreter again to the damsel that waited upon these women, Go into the vestry, and fetch out garments for these people. So she went, and fetched out white raiment, and laid it down before him; so he commanded them to put it on. It was fine linen, white and clean. When the women were thus adorned, they seemed to be a terror one to the other, for that they could not see that glory, each one on herself, which they could see in each other. Now therefore they began to esteem each other better than themselves; for you are fairer than I am, said one, and you are more comely than I am, said another.[50]

Altogether, an orthodox Tridentine account of the effects of the Sacrament of Baptism. When therefore we read, on the last page of "Grace Abounding:" "These things" ("seven abominations in my heart, inclinings to unbelief, wanderings and coldness in prayer," and "my corruptions" generally) "convince me of the insufficiency of all inherent righteousness," though the language is Lutheran, yet it is susceptible of a Catholic sense, and so I think was vaguely understood by the writer. Bunyan felt and meant that no justification and clearance of sin, accorded to ordinary mortals in the world, is so inherent and so self-sufficient as to bar all possibility of further falling away, either into mortal sin, or much more readily into those venial sins from which, as the Council of Trent defines, no mortal man is wholly exempt except by quite an extraordinary and unique grace.[51] The justified man still needs to be forgiven again and again for his venial negligences. He needs to be watchful against mortal sin. He needs recurring actual graces; sanctifying grace is not sufficient to enable him to do meritorious acts. And much human frailty and imperfection is mixed up with the meritorious acts which he does. Therefore, while solicitous to do good works, he should never rely or plume himself upon what he has done. His work is sadly imperfect; and whatever good there is in it is more of God's mercy than of his doing (Romans ix., 16). And as no works of a sinner can merit his first justification, so no works of a saint can merit his final perseverance. Both the beginning and the consummation of salvation is God's gratuitous, unmerited gift. This is ordinary Catholic spirituality; and this is what dwelt in the mind and lay deep down in the heart of John Bunyan. All who have read the life of St. Gertrude and use her prayers will be familiar with her favorite devotion of compensating for the many imperfections, which she recognized in her actions, by offering to God the dispositions and affections of the Sacred Heart. In this way, Christ is invited to *cover* the defects of His just ones, not that there is no good

[50] "Pilgrim's Progress," Part II., page 192. [51] Sess. 6, can. 23.

in what they do, *e. g.*, in their prayer or in their administration of correction, but there is not a whole and entire good; the prayer is mingled with distractions, and the correction with impatience. The good works of the just are not *filthy rags* (Isai. lxiv., 6), but neither are they of the finest white linen with never a hole or a stain.[52]

The reader who has followed me will see in the God-fearing tinker of Elstow, an earnest, prayerful Christian, faithful apparently to such light as Heaven vouchsafed to him, and that with a fidelity which should make us ashamed of our easy, jaunty way of going to heaven, and of the little fear that we have of sin and its consequences. Bunyan's words to Cobb, the Clerk of the Peace, are his testimony to all time:

> I bless the Lord that my heart is at that point, that if any man can lay anything to my charge, either in doctrine or practice, in this particular, that can be proved error or heresy, I am willing to disown it, even in the very market-place; but if it be truth, then to stand to it to the last drop of my blood. And, Sir, said I, you ought to commend me for so doing. To err and to be a heretic are two things. I am no heretic, because I will not stand refractorily to defend any one thing that is contrary to the Word. Prove anything which I hold to be an error, and I will recant it.[53]

JOSEPH RICKABY.

Oxford, England.

THE ANCIENT CATHEDRALS OF SCOTLAND.

PART II.

BEAUTIFUL as were many of the buildings belonging to the old Scottish Cathedrals, none surpassed in dignity and grace the glorious Church of the Holy Trinity at Elgin, which merited the poetic title of "The Lantern of the North."[1] The seat of the Bishop of Moray was transferred from Spynie to Elgin, two miles distant, by Bishop Andrew, in the thirteenth century. A church of considerable size already existed, but many additions were necessary to fit it for its more exalted rank. Whatever may have been done by Bishop Andrew was rendered of no avail by a fire which broke out fifty years after and consumed at least a portion of the edifice. Fresh efforts were made by successive bishops to restore

[52] This favorite Lutheran text I only find once in Bunyan, "Pilgrim's Progress," Part I., page 127; in the opening lines the reference is rather to Zach. iii., 3, 4. He applies it, as from the context both of Isaias and Zachary any such mention of *rags* ought to be applied, to the works of the yet unjustified sinner. [53] "Relation of Imprisonment," page 419.

[1] The authorities followed in this sketch of Elgin Cathedral are chiefly "The History of Moray and Nairn," by Charles Rampini, LL. D., and Walcott's "Ancient Church of Scotland." Others will be quoted in passing.

the Cathedral to its former splendor between 1270, the date of the fire, and 1390. During that period a Chapter House, porch, choir aisles and probably other additions were made. But in 1390 occurred a serious disaster. Alexander, Earl of Buchan, fourth son of King Robert II. by his first wife, Elizabeth Mure, had been angered by the Bishop of Moray's adverse decision in a suit brought against the Earl by his outraged wife Eupheme, Countess of Ross, and in revenge seized on some of that prelate's lands. The bishop excommunicated him and the infuriated noble, who from his fierce temper and cruel disposition had earned the title of "Wolf of Badenoch," swooped down on Elgin with a lawless horde of "wyld, wykkyd Heland-men,"[2] and gave the whole city to the flames, including the beautiful Cathedral with all its books and ornaments.

This wanton outrage nearly broke the heart of the aged bishop, Robert Barr, who made a piteous appeal to the King for help. But again, in 1402, a fresh attack was made on the church by Alexander, son of Donald Lord of the Isles. After burning the town and spoiling the goods of the canons, he was met by the bishop, William of Spynie, at the gate of the Cathedral and was so touched by the prelate's bold rebuke that he confessed his fault and begged for forgiveness and eventually received solemn pardon for his offense. Henceforward the beautifying and improving of their Cathedral was the chief object of each succeeding bishop and met with no further rebuff. The buildings were receiving continual additions till 1538, little more than twenty years before the southern churches of Scotland were wrecked, and after Henry VIII. had forced England into schism and was robbing monasteries and churches wholesale. The fact is only one more proof of the staunch nature of Scottish Catholicity.

The completed building was one of much magnificence, as its very ruins testify. Its ground-plan was cruciform and its style of architecture early English and Flamboyant. The western entrance, approached by a flight of broad steps, was a great doorway deeply recessed and having a double portal. It was surmounted by a noble window 27 feet high, filled with rich tracery and flanked on either side by lofty massive towers, at present nearly 90 feet in height, and probably surmounted formerly by wooden spires. The nave was 100 feet in length and consisted of six bays of pointed arches, supported on clustered pillars richly carved. Beyond the aisles, on either side, were six chapels, something like those in Chichester Cathedral. There was a "marriage porch" to the southwest. The short transepts had each one altar towards the east, that of SS. Peter and Paul to the north and that of St. Thomas to the south. At the

[2] Wyntoun, "Orygynale Cronykil," lib. ix., c. xii.

point of junction rose a fine central tower. The choir of four bays had aisles terminating in chapels with altars, and beyond it was a Lady Chapel lighted by eastern windows of unusual beauty, consisting of two rows of five tall lancets surmounted by a wheel window. To the northeast stood a very fine octagonal Chapter House, its vaulted ceiling supported on a central pillar; this latter was most elaborately carved with shields and various emblems of the Passion, and on one side was formed a stone book rest. The legend runs that this pillar was the work of an apprentice, whose master became so jealous that in his fury he murdered his talented pupil; for this reason the Chapter House is often called the "Prentice Aisle." The same story is told of a famous pillar in Roslin Chapel near Edinburgh. The stone carving at Elgin Cathedral was more than usually ornate.

In Catholic times the services of the Cathedral of Moray were carried out with much solemnity. The choir, separated from the nave by a splendid rood-screen of carved wood, richly colored and gilded, contained twenty-two stalls for canons and dignitaries. Every day three Masses were celebrated in choir, at which a goodly number of the clergy were present, clad in their surplices and black choir copes—close-fitting vestments with armholes[3]—except on great feasts, when all wore silken copes of the color of the day.[4] These Masses were: (1) The Lady Mass, sung after the Office of Prime in the early morning, (2) the Chapter Mass for the dead, which might be a Low Mass, (3) the Solemn High Mass of the feast, sung daily at 9 o'clock. In 1331 there were seventeen resident chaplains, who received regular stipends for officiating at certain altars. Among these were those of the Holy Rood, Our Lady, St. James and St. Nicholas. In the churchyard, on the south side, was a detached chapel dedicated to St. Thomas, which Thomas Fitz Ralph, Earl of Moray, founded with an endowment for five chaplains. The services of the Cathedral, as the ancient chartulary testifies, were carried out in accordance with the ornate ritual followed in the Church of Salisbury and known as the Sarum Rite; it was common to nearly all the Cathedrals of England and Scotland.[5]

The canons and prebendaries resided in the buildings known as the "College." These formed a spacious oblong about 900 yards in circuit, enclosed in a lofty wall containing four gates. Portions of the Bishop's Palace, Deanery and Manses of the Canons still remain, as well as many other ancient buildings and fragments of the bygone greatness of this now quiet little town.

It is to one of the bishops of this see, David (1299), that the Scots

[3] Pearson, "Sarum Missal," p. lvi. (note), [4] Ibid, p. lvi. [5] *Vide*, Spalding Club Miscellany, Vol. II., p. 366.

College in Paris owes its foundation. His successor continued and completed the work. Several other of the prelates of Moray figure in history as men of note. Bishop Winchester (1437-1458) was chaplain to King James II. and was sent as envoy to England. Bishop James Stewart (1459-1461) was Lord Treasurer; Bishop Tulloch (1477-82) was Keeper of the Privy Seal; Bishop Hepburn (1516-24) was Lord Treasurer.

The Cathedral of Moray escaped the molestation of "reformers;" the last Catholic bishop held possession of his castle at Spynie, and when he died, in 1573, was buried in the choir of Elgin.[6] The beginning of the ruin of the beautiful building was in 1568, when the Privy Council ordered the lead to be stripped from the roof and sold for the support of the army.[7] When this had been accomplished the elements at once commenced the work of destruction. Yet, in spite of the state of the Cathedral, Mass was offered in it by Father Gordon, uncle to the Earl of Huntly, in 1594. The Catholic nobles had defeated the Protestant forces under Argyll at Glenlivat a few months before, and the zealous priest on this occasion endeavored by his powerful exhortations to sustain the courage of the Catholic party and persuade them to continue their resistance; but recent reverses had chilled their ardor and they fled to the continent for safety.[8] This was the last Mass ever celebrated in Elgin Cathedral.

In 1637, "upon the 4th of December, on the night, there arose an high wind, which blew down the couples (*i. e.*, beams or rafters) standing on the college (*i. e.*, collegiate) Kirk of Elgin, whilk had endured many winds before, and never fell till now."[9] Thus does an old seventeenth century writer chronicle the first disaster following on the stripping-off of the lead seventy years before. It would seem, from his way of putting it, that the building stood deserted, cared for by none. Yet we know that such was not the case, for the Records of the Presbytery tell how even as late as 1640, Catholics were wont to steal into the sacred precincts to pray before the traces of the holy pictures which still remained in some part of the building.[10] It was, doubtless, this fact that urged some of the more zealous Protestants to the act of iconoclastic zeal related by the writer already quoted. His account runs thus: "Monday the 28th of December (1640), Mr. Gilbert Ross, minister at Elgin, accompanied with the young laird of Innes, the laird of Brodie and some others, without authority brake down the timber partition-wall dividing the Kirk of Elgin frae the quire (this was evidently the rood-screen), whilk had stood ever since the reformation, near seven score

[6] Keith, "Scottish Bishops" (ed. Russel), p. 150. [7] Shaw, "Hist. of Province of Moray," Vol. III., p. 285. [8] Fraser-Tytler, "Hist. of Scot.," Vol. IV. (ed. 1864), p. 231. [9] Spalding, "Hist. of Troubles in Scot.," p. 45. [10] Shaw, "Hist. of Prov. Moray," Vol. III., p. 285.

years or above. On the west side was painted in excellent colours, illuminated with stars of bright gold, the crucifixion of our blessed Saviour Jesus Christ. This piece was so excellently done, that the colours never faded, but kept haill (whole) and sound as at the beginning, notwithstanding this college or channery-kirk wanted the roof since the reformation, and no haill windows therein to save the same from storm, snow, sleet or wet, whilk myself saw; and marvellous to consider! on the other side of this wall, towards the east, was drawn the day of judgment; but all is thrown to the ground. It was said their minister caused to bring home to his house the timber thereof, and burn the samen for serving his kitchen and other uses; but each night the fire went out wherein it was burnt, and could not be kept in to kindle the morning fire, as use is! Whereat the servants marvelled; and thereupon the minister left off and forbore to bring in or burn any more of that timber in his house."[11]

Further havoc was wrought by Cromwell's soldiers between 1650 and 1660; these worthies mutilated the carvings, especially the magnificent west window, and destroyed the figures of angels and saints which yet remained undisturbed. In 1711, on Easter Sunday, the central tower fell with a crash, burying nave and transepts in its ruins. It had probably been undermined by the removal of stones for their own use by masons of the town at various times. Luckily no one was injured by this catastrophe, although children and others had been previously walking about. For more than a century after that the place was a mere quarry for all who chose to carry off the stone, and the churchyard became a receptacle for rubbish.

In 1824 a certain John Shanks, described as "an idle gossiping creature," was made custodian of the ruins. "He was a lank, spider-like being, with a quiet enthusiasm in his manner,"[12] and made the clearing of the ruins the work of his life. With his own hands he removed some thousands of cubic feet of earth, bringing to light the south porch, of which there had previously been no record, as well as the steps leading to the western entrance, the foundations of the pillars and many other portions, long buried under heaps of *debris*.[13] The neighboring farmers, hearing of his praiseworthy efforts, lent horses and carts to help him. The result of his untiring labor was the exposing to view of the whole ground-plan of the Cathedral, but the continuous exertion wore out the strength of the zealous custodian, who was an elderly man when he undertook the work. "The rubbish made an auld man of me," he said to Lord Cockburn after fourteen years of labor. He died aged 83, in 1841. Lord Cockburn wrote his epitaph in language which the authority who quotes

[11] Spalding, "Hist. of the Troubles," pp. 223. 4. [12] Billings, "Antiquities of Scot," Vol. II. [13] "New Stat. Acct. of Scot.," Vol. XIII., Elgin, p. 7.

it styles "not a whit too strong." The stone upon which it is engraved has been built into the boundary wall of the Cathedral precincts. The epitaph concludes as follows: "For seventeen years he was the Keeper and the Shower of this Cathedral, and while not even the Crown was doing anything for its preservation, he with his own hands cleared it of many thousand cubic yards of rubbish, disclosing the bases of its pillars, collecting the carved fragments, and introducing some order and propriety. Whoso reverences the Cathedral will respect the memory of this man."[14] No visitor who sees the admirable care with which the venerable ruins are now guarded and preserved can fail to endorse the eulogium. It was the interest excited in the discoveries made by the worthy custodian that led to a true appreciation of the picturesque remains.

A fairly complete idea of the original church may be gained by a careful examination of the portions which still exist. The western towers are still about 85 feet high and can be ascended by the original staircase. The greater part of the choir with its south aisle and the Lady Chapel are standing; they are quite roofless, but the tracery in some of the windows is almost perfect. A portion of the south transept with its altar is still in good preservation. The most entire of all the buildings is the beautiful Chapter House, which is the only part retaining a roof. Attached to it is a small cloister containing a Lavatory. It was here that a soldier's orphan child was cradled by a poverty stricken mother in 1748. The boy grew up, entered the army, acquired promotion and considerable wealth, and after living several years in his native town died in London in 1824, leaving £70,000 ($350,000) to build and endow the "Elgin Institution for the education of youth and support of old age"—a foundation whose charities are a boon to the town.

Besides the slab of blue marble marking the burial place of Bishop Andrew, the original founder of the church, many other interesting monuments are to be seen. One is that of Bishop Innes (1414), another that of the Duke of Albany, beheaded in 1425 for rebellion against James I.; the first Earl of Huntly (1470), and Bishop Winchester (1458) have also tombs here; the latter is under an arch which still bears traces of frescoed angels in red outlines. It was here that Duncan, immortalized by Shakespeare in "Macbeth," was laid to rest; by the generosity of King Alexander II., one of Duncan's descendants, a chaplaincy was founded in Elgin Cathedral to provide Masses in perpetuity for the repose of his soul.[15]

The Cathedral of the Holy Trinity at Brechin, in Forfarshire, was probably commenced when the see was founded by King David I.,

[14] Rampini, "Moray and Nairn," p. 111. [15] Robertson, "Scotland Under Her Early Kings," Vol. I., p. 116.

in 1150,[16] and was added to at various periods of its history. At the time of its greatest glory, just before the Reformation, it consisted of a cruciform building measuring nearly 200 feet in entire length. Its nave of five bays was in later pointed style of architecture, the arches being upheld on octagonal and clustered columns. The choir was about 84 feet long and had no aisles. This portion, together with the transepts, was in pure early English style of pointed architecture. The choir contained stalls for the twelve canons who comprised the chapter and for the assistant clergy. The high altar was at the eastern end of the choir. In other parts of the church were altars to St. Thomas the Martyr, St. Ninian, St. Christopher, St. Catherine and others besides those, found in every mediæval church of importance, to the Holy Cross and Our Blessed Lady.

Exteriorly, as the portions still remaining show, this Cathedral did not possess the imposing appearance belonging to some of the others. Its western gable is decorated with what architects call "corbie" (or crow) steps, the stones being fashioned like steps leading to the apex. The west window, richly decorated in the style known as flamboyant, surmounts the noble carved arch of the doorway. The approach is rather spoiled by the great square tower which juts out aggressively at the northwest side, cutting into the western wall close to the head-mouldings of the door and window as though it had been added as an afterthought. This tower was built by Bishop Patrick (1351-73); it has narrow windows at the front and sides up to the height of the church, and above these, under the battlemented gallery at the top, are large windows—one in each face—with early English tracery. An octagonal spire rises from the tower; the entire height is 128 feet. Attached to the southwest angle of the church, though originally built entirely apart from any other building, is the famous "round tower" of Brechin, whose meaning and use have puzzled many antiquarians. It is 85 feet high and about 20 feet in diameter and tapers somewhat towards the top, which is surmounted by a short octagonal cap having dormer windows on four of its sides. The tower is built of a reddish gray sandstone; it contains two square window-openings at different heights, one facing south and the other east, and under the cap are four more of such small windows facing the cardinal points; besides these it has no other lights. A doorway, whose sill is now six feet above the level, is in a semi-circular arch, surmounted by a defaced crucifix; a small statue stands on either side, about half-way up the arch. This round tower is thought to have been built by Irish masons in

16 "The Registrum Episc. Brech," edited by Cosmo Innes, is the chief source of information made use of. Billings, "Antiquities of Scotland," and Walcott's "Ancient Church of Scotland" have supplied some details.

the eleventh century.[17] In Catholic times two bells hung in it; they were transferred in the last century to the square tower on the other side of the church.[18]

Few historical events of importance are connected with Brechin Cathedral, though it was in the castle hard by that Baliol, "the mere shadow of a King,"[19] resigned his kingdom to Edward I., who claimed the authority of over-lord. The unfortunate monarch in presence of the Bishop of Durham and Barons of England was stripped of royal robes, crown and sceptre and forced, "standing as a criminal, with a white rod in his hand, to perform a humiliating feudal penance."[20] A few of the bishops of this see filled high offices; thus, Patrick de Locrys was Lord Chancellor in 1372 and John de Crannoch held that office in 1436. The latter was employed on an embassy to France for James I. and also accompanied that monarch's daughter, the Princess Margaret, to her marriage with the Dauphin.[21] It was probably on returning from this journey that he made a vow when on the sea to give two silver candlesticks to his Cathedral upon his safe return. This vow he fulfilled by delivering six silver cups for the making of the same to John Lyall, the Treasurer of the church, on April 14, 1434, as the Register testifies.[22] Bishop George Schoriswod was Chancellor of Scotland in 1458.

The last prelate who actually held the see previous to the Reformation was John Hepburn, who died in 1558. Donald Campbell, abbot of Cupar, youngest son of Archibald, second Earl of Argyle, was nominated to Brechin by Queen Mary, but failed to receive Papal confirmation, and never assumed the episcopal title. He is said to have been in favor of the Reformation movement,[23] and as he took part without protest in the convention of 1560 which established Protestantism, the charge seems justified. He had been made Lord Privy Seal in 1554. On his death in 1562, John Sinclair, Dean of Restalrig, a zealous Catholic, was nominated to the see by Queen Mary, whose marriage with Lord Darnley he solemnized. He died in 1566 and was the last of the Catholic Bishops of Brechin.

There is no record of any wilful destruction of the Cathedral by the reforming party. The revenues of the see were granted in 1566 to Alexander Campbell, of the family of Argyle, who was a mere boy at the time. He alienated so much of the property that scarcely the "moderate competency for a minister"[24] was left at his death, in

[17] An interesting notice of this tower is to be found in "Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland," Vol. IV., p. 188., from which the above facts have been taken. [18] "New Statis. Acct. of Scot.," Forfarshire, p. 133. [19] Fraser-Tytler, "Hist. of Scot.," Vol. I. (ed. 1864), p. 46. [20] Ibid. [21] Fraser-Tytler, "Hist. of Scot.," Vol. II. (ed. 1864), p. 85. [22] "Regis. Episc. Brech.," p. 60. [23] Rogers, "Rental Book of Cupar Abbey," Grampian Club, p. li., pref. [24] Keith, "Scottish Bishops" (ed. Russel), p. 166.

1606. From this we may conclude that neglect rather than violence was the cause of the decay of a large portion of the Cathedral buildings. It would seem that Brechin during this period was scarcely a desirable place of resort. A contemporary chronicler says that in 1571 there was apprehended "one that keepit ane hostelry at Brechin, who before, at divers times, had murdered sundry that came to lodge with him, the wife being also as busy as the man with a meil (mallet), to fell their guests sleeping in their beds."[25] Truly, a gruesome hostelry!

The Cathedral seems to have been made use of for Protestant worship from the period of the change in religion. In 1637 the so-called bishop, Walter Whitford, like some other Protestant prelates and ministers, resolved to adopt the service-book drawn up for Scotland by Charles I. and Archbishop Laud. He seems to have had little opposition from his people at first, although the minister refused to read the formula and the bishop was obliged to provide a substitute. But on a certain Sunday in November he met with a more hostile reception. The lower orders looked upon any "form of worship" as akin to Popery, and had probably chafed under the infliction for a time, not daring to oppose. On this particular Sunday Bishop Whitford seems to have suspected a rising, for, according to a chronicler, he, "when other feeble cowards couched, went to the pulpit with his pistols, his servants, and as the report goes, his wife with weapons. He entered early, when there were few people. He closed the doors and read his service. But when he was done he could scarce get to his house—all flocked about him; and had he not fled he might have been killed. Since, he durst never try that play over again."[26] Indeed he had eventually to leave the kingdom and content himself with the slender revenues of an English country parish.

Brechin Cathedral has seen many changes in its time, but none so radical as the "restoration" of the fabric carried out between 1805 and 1807. With a view to increasing the sitting accommodation, the church was subjected to the most barbarous deformation possible. The outer walls of the aisles were built considerably higher and fitted with common sash windows, and in the space thus contrived were placed deep galleries running round four sides of the building—for the chancel arch was blocked up. Besides these alterations the very bases and capitals of the pillars were cut away and some of the arches defaced. To complete the "improvements," as they were called, a flat plaster ceiling was made across the whole building, cutting off the upper part of some of the windows with their fine tracery and

[25] Bannatyne's, "Journal," Chambers' Domes. Annals, Vol. I., p. 78. [26] Baillie, "Letters and Journals," I. 41. Quoted by Burton, "Hist. Scot.," Vol. VI., p. 450.

leaving only the plain stone mullions visible. In this way a beautiful Gothic building was transformed into a hideous meeting-house, crammed with pews and galleries and with a pulpit in the centre. It was a consistent carrying out of Protestant principles to remove all trace of altar and sanctuary and give prominence to preaching. It is a pleasing sign of the change that has come over Scottish Presbyterianism during the last half century that a vigorous movement was set on foot some four years ago towards the restoration of the venerable pile. One difficulty in the way had always been the insufficiency of church accommodation should the disfiguring galleries—the cause of all the deformation—be removed. Fortunately a former minister bequeathed money for the building of a new church in the town, and thus the path was clear towards the restoration of the Cathedral on artistic lines. The work begun in 1900 is now completed. The walls which had been raised in 1807 have been pulled down, the aisles rebuilt and all the interior excrescences cleared away. The choir has been again thrown into the church, after being renovated and roofed, and a new north aisle has been added. The Cathedral, thanks to the generosity and good taste of its present owners, has been restored as far as possible in outward semblance to its original grace and dignity of architecture and form.[27]

The See of Dunblane, Perthshire, was founded by King David I.[28] about the year 1140 by reviving the ancient bishopric of Stratherne.[29] A Columban monastery had been formerly established there by St. Blane, a saint of Bute, who had preached the Gospel in that part of Perthshire—hence the title.[30] The records of the see have been lost, and some portions of its early history are buried in obscurity. The first bishop to whom we owe the beginnings of the fine Cathedral whose remains are still to be seen was Bishop Clement, who ruled the see in 1233. He was a Dominican friar, of foreign origin, renowned for his learning, and is said to have received the habit of his order from St. Dominic himself.[31] At the time of his appointment to Dunblane the diocese was in so wretched a plight that he made a journey to Rome to lay the case before the Holy See. The revenues were in the hands of seculars; for the see, until restored by King David, had been vacant for more than a century, and no bishop had as yet succeeded in regaining his full rights. The church was ruined and desolate; its revenues were barely sufficient to support the bishop for half a year; there were no canons—merely a simple priest to say Mass thrice a week in the roofless church.[32] Pope Gregory IX., in

[27] For the particulars regarding the restoration, the writer is indebted to information courteously supplied by the present parish minister of Brechin, the Rev. W. W. Coats, B. D. [28] Laing, "Historians of Scot.," Vol. IX., p. 246. [29] Robertson, "Scottish Abbeys and Cathedrals," p. 49. [30] Skene, "Celtic Scotland," Vol. II., 403. [31] Robertson, "Scott. Abbeys," loc. cit. [32] Theiner, "Monumenta Historica," p. 35. Fordun, "Scotichronicon," lib. x., cap. xi.

answer to Bishop Clement's appeal, directed the Bishops of Glasgow and Dunkeld to raise funds from the various parishes of the diocese to place matters on a proper footing.[33] So energetic was Clement in the work of building his Cathedral and reconstructing his bishopric, that during his twenty-five years of rule he was able to give to Dunblane "a stately sanctuary, enriched with lands and possessions, served by canons and pretendaries."[34]

The church, when completed, consisted of an aisleless choir measuring 80 feet in length and 30 in width, and a nave 130 feet long. There were no transepts; a square tower, rising to the height of 128 feet, stood on the south side of the church in the place which a south transept would have occupied. This tower, as is evident at the present day, was anterior to Bishop Clement; its lower stories are Norman in style and its upper stages of later work. It is probably the only remaining portion of King David's early church. The severe Early English choir was also built before the restoration of Bishop Clement. To that prelate we owe the fine nave of eight bays in pointed style. Instead of a triforium, a passage was constructed in the thickness of the wall, level with the clerestory windows, which were adorned with double arches and tracery so that the passage led between the two arches. These windows were remarkable for their beautiful tracery. The west gable had three very long and narrow windows placed close together, and these also had double tracery with a passage between. Over them was a small "vesica"-shaped window surrounded on the outside by a carved fringe of bay-leaf ornaments arranged in zigzag fashion, their points touching. This window, which may still be seen, has received high praise, as a feature of singular beauty, from no less an authority than the late Mr. Ruskin. In a lecture delivered at Edinburgh he thus alluded to it: "Do you recollect the west window of your own Dunblane Abbey?[35] It is acknowledged to be beautiful by the most careless observer. And why beautiful? Simply because in its great contours it has the form of a forest leaf, and because in its decoration it has used nothing but forest leaves. He was no common man who designed that Cathedral of Dunblane. I know nothing so perfect in its simplicity, and so beautiful, so far as it reaches, in all the Gothic with which I am acquainted. And just in proportion to his power of mind, that man was content to work under Nature's teaching; and instead of putting a merely formal dog-tooth, as everybody else did at the time, he went down to the woody bank of the sweet river beneath the rocks on which he was building, and he took up a few of

[33] Theiner, loc. cit. [34] Fordun, l. c. [35] Dunblane was never an abbey except when the Columban monks were established there. It may be this connection that the lecturer had in mind at the time.

the fallen leaves that lay by it, and he set them in his arch, side by side forever."[36]

The Cathedral possessed at least eight altars. These bore the dedications of Holy Trinity, Our Lady, St. Michael, St. Blaise, St. Nicholas, St. Stephen and St. Blane, and in addition there was the High Altar. Several of these altars had annual revenues for services and sustentation. Thus the High Altar was endowed by Archdeacon Newton, early in the sixteenth century, to secure a daily Mass there. Our Lady's Altar, also, as well as St. Stephen's and St. Blane's, had fixed revenues. That of St. Nicholas was endowed in 1509 by Dean Walter Drummond, "for the support of one chaplain to pray daily for the safety of the souls of the King,[37] the Queen, Prince Arthur, John, Lord Drummond (brother of the donor) and Elizabeth, the wife of the said John, and the late John Drummond, Dean of Dunblane."[38] There seems to have been also an altar and chaplain of St. Fillan[39] in the Cathedral.

The chapter consisted of a dean and some fifteen canons and prebendaries; amongst them, by virtue of their respective offices, were the Abbots of Arbroath and Cambuskenneth, while the Abbot of Inchaffray held the office of preceptor, equivalent to that of an English Cathedral provost.[40] In 1492, Pope Innocent VIII. raised Glasgow to archiepiscopal rank and made Dunblane, together with Dunkeld, Galloway and Argyle, its suffragan sees.[41] Dunkeld and Dunblane, however, were restored to the province of St. Andrews some few years later.[42]

The small, remote see was but rarely associated with great historical events. Edward I., in 1303, ordered the lead to be stripped from the roofs of the churches of Perth and Dunblane to provide for the siege of Stirling, but gave particular injunctions that those portions of the roofs that lay over the altars should be left undisturbed. Bishop Maurice, when Abbot of Inchaffray, was present at the battle of Bannockburn, where he acted as confessor to the Bruce and said Mass before the battle.

> "Of Inchafra the abbot of greit fame,
> Quhilk callit wes Mauritius to his name,
> Solempnitle that day ane mes sang he,
> In sic ane place quhair all the oist mycht se."[43]

---

[36] "Ordnance Gazetteer of Scotland" (new ed.), Vol. II., p. 410. [37] This was James IV., who died at Flodden four years later. Prince Arthur died in 1510. [38] The particulars concerning the altars, as well as some other facts of information, have been gathered from an unsigned article in the "Scotsman" of October 15, 1892, entitled "Dunblane and Its Cathedral." [39] Walcott, "Ancient Church of Scotland," p. 203. [40] Walcott, p. 203. [41] Theiner, "Monumenta," p. 505. [42] Grub, "Eccl. Hist. of Scot.," Vol. I., p. 388. [43] "Buik of the Cronichis of Scotland," Rolls Series, Vol. III., p. 229. It may be as well to subjoin a version in modern English spelling:

> "Of Inchaffray the abbot of great fame,
> Who called was Mauritius to his name,
> Solemnly that day a Mass sang he,
> In such a place where all the host might see."

It was on this occasion that the relic of the arm of St. Fillan, which the abbot had inadvertently left behind at his abbey, was miraculously brought (as the old historian relates) to fill the empty reliquary. The circumstance was regarded as a presage of coming victory.[44] Bishop Michael Ochiltree, whose effigy is shown in the nave, adorned his Cathedral with many gifts and built Knaig Bridge and a church at Muthill. He crowned James II. at Holyrood in 1437. Bishop James Chisholm (1487) was one of James III.'s chaplains. The last Catholic bishop, William Chisholm, was afterwards raised to the See of Vaison, in France, and became a Carthusian monk at Grenoble before his death.[45] The Chartulary of Dunblane is said to have been carried abroad at the Reformation and has been lost sight of, consequently the information to be gained concerning the history of the Cathedral is but meagre.[46]

The Bishop of Dunblane, being a noted opponent of the Reformation, was certain to bring upon himself the vengeance of the Protestant party. Together with other prelates of like opinions he was deprived by the Parliament of August, 1560, of all right to tithes on lands leased out during the previous two years.[47] No authentic record remains of the actual demolition of the Cathedral, but as Dunkeld was systematically ruined there is every reason to suppose that Dunblane, in the same county, and only about twenty miles distant, met with a similar fate. At any rate, the choir was the only portion fit for use as a parish church after the Reformation; the nave was roofless and its very beams had been broken up for firewood when, in 1588, the King had to be petitioned to save the building from utter destruction.

In 1633 Archbishop Laud, when in Scotland, passed by the ruined Cathedral and was forced, in spite of its forlorn state, to pronounce it "a goodly church." A bystander remarked: "Yes, my Lord, this was a brave kirk before the Reformation." "What, fellow!" cried the prelate, "*De*formation, not *Re*formation!"[48] It was a startling admission from a Protestant Archbishop.

The choir, patched up in some form or other, continued to be used for Presbyterian worship till the year 1872. At that period it underwent a complete restoration at the cost of £2,000 ($10,000). The beautiful carved stalls of fifteenth century work which had previously formed part of the fittings were placed in the chancel and the building was renovated and decorated in many ways. The work of restoration did not stop there, but was continued for three years until the nave also was put into a state of complete repair. The cost of

---

[44] Ibid, p. 227. [45] Keith, "Scottish Bishops," p. 180. [46] Grub, "Eccl. Hist.," Vol. II., p. 347 (note). [47] The above particulars of history are taken from Walcott's "Ancient Church of Scot.," p. 204. [48] Grub, "Eccl. Hist.," Vol. II., p. 87.

the whole work, amounting to some £26,000 ($130,000), was defrayed by private generosity alone. The handsome building, though necessarily devoid of much that added to its beauty and interest in Catholic days, nevertheless affords some idea of what it must have been in its glory.

Many interesting monuments have been preserved. Among them are effigies of Bishop Finlay Dermoch (1419), the builder of the bridge over the Allan, and of Malise Earl of Strathearne and his Countess. Previous to repairs undertaken in 1817, three slabs of plain blue marble marked the resting place of three daughters of John, Lord Drummond. They were graves to which much interest was attached by reason of the sad fate of the unfortunate ladies whose bodies lay there. Eupheme, Lady Fleming, and Margaret and Sibylla Drummond were poisoned in 1501 by means of a meal of which they all partook, and were buried together in Dunblane Cathedral. The reason for the crime and its perpetrators have never been satisfactorily ascertained. Margaret, who was the mistress of James IV., is thought by some to have been privately married to the King and to have fallen a victim to the jealousy of certain nobles who feared the exaltation of the family of Drummond by a public acknowledgment of the marriage. The matter, however, cannot be proved.

Dunblane, in these days, is a place of little consequence. In a work published half a century ago it is thus described: "In the broad valley which separates the Grampian mountains from the chain of the Ochils, southward by a few miles of the green ramparts of Ardoch, where the Romans have left unperishing memorials of their far-reaching energy and enterprise, there lies a pleasant, sequestered, peaceful village, holding, by courtesy, the title of a cathedral city."[49] Since that time there have been some few changes; the train now rushes the traveler through the pleasant scenery, and the station stands under the very eminence crowned by the gray tower of the Cathedral. Yet the place has gained very little by such changes; the centre of its life has long departed, and like the renovated church, which was the cause of such greatness as the little town could once boast of, Dunblane is but a helpless witness of what Scotland lost when she renounced the Catholic faith.

The See of Ross was one of those founded by King David I.; its existence dates from about the year 1128. The first Cathedral was built at Rosemarkie on the western shore of the Moray Firth. It stood on the site of an ancient church raised by the Irish St. Boniface or Kiritinus, who evangelized the district in the eighth century. A new Cathedral was erected about the beginning of the fourteenth

[49] Billings, "Baronial and Ecclesiastical Antiquities of Scotland," Vol. II.

century at a spot then known as Chanonry, situated about a mile from Rosemarkie on the other side of the promontory called Chanonry Point. The two little burghs were united by James II. in 1444 into one town under the name of Fortrose.[50]

The later Cathedral, dedicated to St. Peter and St. Boniface, was a small building of rich red sandstone and is considered to have been of remarkable beauty. "The style," says a competent authority, "is the purest and most elaborate Middle Pointed; and the whole church, though probably not 120 feet long, must have been an architectural gem of the very first description. The exquisite beauty of the mouldings shows that in whatever other respect these remote parts of Scotland were barbarous, in ecclesiology, at least, they were on a par with any other branch of the mediæval church."[51] The building consisted of a nave 30 feet wide, of four bays, with aisles 14 feet wide, a choir with aisles, an eastern Lady Chapel, a vaulted Chapter House to the northeast and a western tower. There were small transepts and a turret over the rood-loft. The great east window was a particularly fine one of five lights.

An amusing local legend relates that the Moray fairies, envious of the splendid Cathedral at Fortrose, constructed a road across the Firth and carried the church bodily to Elgin, translating the Elgin Cathedral to Fortrose. When daylight surprised them at their work the "little people" had succeeded in destroying the road with the exception of a portion near the shore on either side. These portions are now known as Chanonry Point, near Fortrose, and Ardersier, the promontory near Fort George, on the Moray side. This is the Morayshire edition of the legend, but that current in Ross-shire says that the fairies were constructing the road at night when a Highlander, passing by, wished the work "God speed," and thus broke the charm before the fairy workmen had succeeded in accomplishing more than is now seen in the two points referred to. The variety in the tradition illustrates the jealousy of the people for the renown of their particular Cathedrals; Ross claiming for theirs the title of the more beautiful building and Moray declaring that in any case it had been transferred to them.[52]

The Chapter of the Cathedral of Ross consisted of a Dean and six other dignitaries, with twelve canons and prebendaries and several vicars and chaplains. The residences of Bishop and Chapter, which gave the name of Chanonry to the neighborhood of the Cathedral and the small town which surrounded it, seem to have been worthy of the beautiful church. The last Catholic bishop of the see thus

---

[50] The authorities followed with regard to this cathedral are Walcott's "Ancient Church of Scotland" and "Origines Parochiales Scotiae" (Bannatyne Club), Vol. II., Pt. II. (Rosemarkie). [51] Neale, quoted by Robertson, "Scottish Abbeys and Cathedrals," p. 74. [52] *Vide*, "Ordnance Gazetteer of Scot.," Rosemarkie.

refers to them: "The name of the Toune situat vpon the syd of the ffirth, is named the Chanrie, quhair (*is*) the Bischopes Palice, nocht far distant frome the Channounis houses, in beutie, and magnificence, Inferiour to verie few with us."[53]

Many of the lands belonging to the Cathedral had been given for the benefit of the chaplains in common; others were endowments for particular altars. Thus in 1451 there is record of certain charters granted to the Chapel of St. Nicholas. In 1512, King James IV. renewed a grant of lands for payment of the services of a perpetual chaplain in the church; in 1529, James V. presented Sir William Spens to a chaplaincy founded by his predecessors—probably that referred to in the earlier document—and such presentations were made by the same King and by Queen Mary after him, as often as the benefice fell vacant. A chaplaincy of St. Lawrence and another of St. Boniface are alluded to in various deeds and many others existed bearing the names of the lands which furnished their revenues; thus there were the chaplaincies of Alnes (three in number), Obstull, Drummond, Navity, Munlochy, Kynnok and the like.

Some of the bishops are renowned in the history of the country. Bishop Elphinstone, founder of Aberdeen University, for example, was occupant of the See of Ross before he was translated to Aberdeen in 1484. Bishop John Fraser had been Abbot of the Cistercian house of Melrose. He was made a Privy Councillor in 1506. Bishop Robert Cairncrosse, formerly Abbot of the famous house of Austin Canons at Holyrood, Edinburgh, was made Bishop of Ross in 1534. He was a chaplain of James V. and became in 1528 Lord Treasurer of the kingdom. On the death of the King he was made one of the Lords of the Council to the Governor, the Earl of Arran. Bishop Henry Sinclair had been in early life a great favorite with James V. He was a learned Canonist and became Vice President of the College of Justice. But the most celebrated of all the bishops of this see was, undoubtedly, John Leslie. He had been educated at Aberdeen and Paris; in the latter university he took his doctorate. In 1560, when official of Aberdeen, he was chosen by the Lords of the Congregation to discuss points of faith with John Knox at Edinburgh; nothing was settled by the discussion, but as Leslie was detained in Edinburgh and prohibited from preaching it would seem that the Protestant party were in fear of his powers. When Queen Mary was invited to return home from France, Leslie was sent by the Catholic party to place their loyal services at the Queen's disposal. He accompanied Mary to Scotland, and this was the commencement of a life-long attachment to his sovereign which was to

[53] Leslie, "Hist. of Scot.," from the M. S. translation from the Latin made by Fr. James Dalrymple, O. S. B., of the Scots Monastery of Ratisbon in 1596, and preserved at Fort Augustus Abbey.

make him famous in the history of his time. He was made Bishop of Ross in 1565 and continued to be the Queen's confidential agent till her untimely end. Imprisoned in 1572 by Elizabeth of England for his share in striving to bring about a marriage between the Queen of the Scots and the Duke of Norfolk, he was banished the realm and visited the courts of France, Spain and Germany to ask help for his royal mistress, but without success. He went to Rome in 1575 and afterwards was named Coadjutor to the Archbishop of Rouen, though he never enjoyed the dignity. The news of his Queen's tragic end caused him such grief that he gave up the world and retired to a monastery of Austin Canons at Brussels, where he died in 1596. He left behind him many valuable writings.[54]

It would seem that the Cathedral buildings were long left unmolested during the troublous times of the Reformation period. Bishop Leslie obtained the see after the disastrous events in the southern parts of the country and seems to have been able to preserve his own with singular ability. Under James VI., however, the Cathedral of Ross had to suffer the fate of other churches of the same nature. In 1572, while the rightful bishop was in prison in England, William, Lord Ruthven, received a grant of "the haill leid quhairwith the cathedrall kirk of Ros wes theikit alsweill principal kirk as queir and ilis thairof,"[55] to sell or otherwise dispose of at his pleasure. The temporalities were bestowed upon Lord Methuen in 1585. The stonework, doubtless much decayed in places by the weather, after being left roofless for nearly a century, was sacrilegiously carried off by Cromwell to build a fort in Inverness in 1653. In this way the whole of the Bishop's Palace and the greater part of the church were demolished. The only remains now to be seen are a portion of the south aisles of nave and choir and the detached chapter house. A soft toned bell, carried off by Cromwell, now hangs in the old square tower of Inverness High Church. It is said to have been the "Angelus" Bell. Several sepulchral monuments are still to be seen among the ruins. A canopied tomb of a lady, said to have been a Countess of Ross, who died in 1380, is pronounced by Neale, "one of the most beautiful monuments I ever saw."[56] The body of a bishop, supposed to have been buried more than 300 years, was found in one of the tombs in 1797 and is mentioned in the *London Chronicle* of October 12 in that year. In 1854, the same tomb, or that of another bishop was accidentally opened and an entire skeleton, swathed in beautiful silk and gold damask and clothed in silken

[54] These particulars of Bishop Leslie's life are taken from "Historical Records of the Family of Leslie," Vol. III., p. 402-7. [55] Orig. Paroch. Scotiae, p. 572. An English version may be useful to readers unversed in Scottish idiom. "The whole of the lead wherewith the Cathedral Church of Ross was roofed—the nave as well as the choir and aisles thereof."

[56] Quoted in Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, Vol. I., p. 283.

robes, was found within it. In 1880, a hoard of 1,100 silver coins of the date of Robert III. (1390-1404) was discovered in the Cathedral precincts; the money had apparently been hidden there for safety during perilous times.[57]

The Cathedral of the Diocese of Orkney, which at least one mediæval historian places next to that of Ross in the sequence of sees, was the Church of St. Magnus, Kirkwall.[58] It enjoys the distinction of being the only Scottish Cathedral which exists whole and entire in the present day and that, probably, by reason of its isolated situation on the distant island of the Orkneys known as Pomona or Mainland.

It is worthy of note that Kirkwall Cathedral, like that of Glasgow —the only other in Scotland which can claim anything like architectural completeness dating from Catholic times—rose over the body of a popular saint. St. Magnus[59] was the son of Erlin, the Norwegian Earl of Orkney. His family possessions being seized upon by his cousin Haco in 1116, a contest was imminent. Wishing to avoid bloodshed, Magnus agreed to meet Haco in the neighboring island of Egilshay, so that the dispute might be amicably settled. But Haco treacherously brought with him an armed band and Magnus, after a night spent in prayer and the reception of the sacraments, to prepare for the end which he clearly foresaw, was barbarously slaughtered.[60] His nephew, Earl Ronald, in fulfilment of a vow, erected a bishop's see at Kirkwall and commenced the Cathedral on his acquisition of the earldom of Orkey, about the year 1138. Magnus had been popularly proclaimed a martyr and received the honors due to one, and it was Ronald's intention to translate his remains from Birsay, where they had been laid, to the new church. The building, however, made such slow progress that the works had to be suspended for want of funds and Ronald did not live to see the completion of his design. The body of the martyr was eventually enshrined at Kirkwall, being removed from Christchurch, Birsay, the former seat of the bishopric, to the new Cathedral. It is possible that this was done during Ronald's lifetime, as some suppose that he succeeded in building a portion of the choir and transept.

In course of time the new sanctuary gradually grew in size and splendor until it reached the noble proportions now to be seen. The church was the work of several successive bishops, assisted by alms

[57] "Ordnance Gazetteer of Scotland," Vol. III., p. 55. [58] Billings, "Antiquities of Scotland," and Walcott, "Ancient Church of Scotland," are the chief authorities followed in the account of this Cathedral. Other sources are indicated by notes.

[59] By a decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, July 5, 1898, the *cultus* of S. Magnus, together with that of several other Scottish saints, has been declared to have existed *ab immemorabili tempore.* [60] *Vide* Pinkerton's "Lives of Scottish Saints," Vol. II. *Vita Magni Comitis Orcadum.*

from all the countries of Christendom—for the *cultus* of St. Magnus had become widely spread—and the Cathedral was not really finished till the early part of the sixteenth century.

Like Glasgow Cathedral, Kirkwall also is built on a cruciform ground-plan, but the transepts are longer than those of the former church. Its material is dark red sandstone with ornamentation in yellow stone in certain portions. Seen from the sea it looks almost as large as the whole town, dominating all other buildings by its massive proportions. In reality it is not an extensive church; but its parts are so constructed as to convey to the spectator the impression of its being larger than it actually is. Its total length outside from east to west is 234 feet and its total width 56 feet. The square central tower had once a lofty spire, but it was destroyed by lightning in 1671 and a somewhat squat pyramidal roof has taken its place.

The interior is of striking grandeur. Its vaulted roofs are supported upon twenty-eight massive pillars; those of the nave are grand circular columns, each measuring fifteen feet in circumference, and the arches are semi-circular. The choir is in somewhat later style, though Norman predominates; some of the columns are clustered with carved capitals, but the arches are semi-circular. The east window, dating from about 1511, is of four lights in pointed arches, surmounted by a beautiful rose window; it is thought to have been the contribution to the building of Bishop Edward Stewart. The three tiers of solid Norman arches rising on either side of the nave to the stone roof—for triforium and clerestory are of a like character—give an impression of severe but imposing grandeur. It adds to the perfection of the church that those who carried on the work in its successive periods preserved the character of the original architecture in all the chief portions; they did not, as in so many other instances, continue the building in a style more recently introduced, as though to stamp their own individuality upon what they undertook. Hence, although experts can discover five different styles, to the ordinary observer the church, taken as a whole, seems almost symmetrical—Norman, with few exceptions, predominating.

Kirkwall Cathedral cannot be considered as belonging to the Scottish Church until the fifteenth century; for previous to 1472 the bishops of Orkney were subject to the Archbishop of Drontheim, since the islands belonged to Norway. When James III. espoused Margaret, daughter of Christiern, King of Denmark and Norway, in 1469, the Orkney Islands were pledged to Scotland until the completion of the payment of the dowry bestowed upon the Princess by the marriage contract;[61] as full payment was never made, the islands

[61] Fraser-Tytler, "Hist. of Scot.," Vol. II., chap. iv.

passed permanently under the dominion of the Scottish monarch and Orkney became a suffragan bishopric of St. Andrews. Little is known of the history of the see, the earlier records having perished. Bishop Andrew, in 1486, procured the erection of Kirkwall into a royal burgh with the right of holding courts and having fairs and markets. Bishop Robert Maxwell, in the following century, provided the three fine-toned bells which still hang in the tower, and fitted the choir with stalls. During his bishopric, in 1540,[62] James V. visited in person all the remoter portions of his dominion, including the Orkney Islands, twelve vessels having been prepared and furnished for the voyage. The King "was gratified on reaching the Orkneys by finding these islands in a state of greater improvement and civilization than he had ventured to expect."[63] The bishop, as Leslie informs us, entertained the royal party nobly. "Robert Maxuel," says the quaint translation of Fr. Dalrymple, "than Bischop in thir partes, receiuet the King and al his cumpanie with ane honest table and all sygnes and taiknes *(tokens)* of beneuolence, Honestie and Humanitie."[64] Bishop Maxwell died in that year, or early in the next, as his successor, Bishop Reid, was recommended to the Pope by James V. in a letter dated April 5, 1541.[65]

Robert Reid, the most distinguished occupant of this see, had been educated at St. Andrews University, and in 1526 was made Commendatory Abbot of the Cistercian Monastery of Kinloss, in Moray, receiving the abbatial blessing three years later. He was appointed in 1530 Commendator of Beauly Priory in Ross-shire, and continued to act as superior of both houses even after his nomination to the See of Orkney. He was a man of more than ordinary ability and filled many important functions of state under James V., who frequently consulted him in important affairs. In his two monasteries he was zealous for learning as well as discipline and employed the learned Ferrarius to instruct the monks in classics. In his episcopal city he founded a school for boys, and left in his will funds towards the establishment of an university in Edinburgh, and though nothing was accomplished towards that end for some years after his time, he is justly regarded as the real founder of that institution. Besides adding some important features to Kirkwall Cathedral, Bishop Reid built a fine tower to the Bishop's Palace, where his statue is still to be seen.[66] He re-constituted his Cathedral Chapter, since it had become much disorganized and had dwindled to six canons and six chaplains whose status was altogether undefined.

[62] Walcott, probably following Keith, gives 1536 as the date, but this is impossible. The Treasurer's Accounts for June—Aug., 1540, contain the expenses of the expedition, and Fraser-Tytler in a note to his History (Vol. II., chap. ix.) proves conclusively that it was in that year. [63] Fraser-Tytler, Vol. II., chap. ix. [64] Dalrymple's Leslie, Fort Augustus M. S. [65] Stuart, "Records of the Monastery of Kinloss," pref, p. li. [66] "Ordnance Gazetteer of Scot.," Kirkwall.

Under the new arrangement it consisted of seven dignitaries—dean, archdeacon, precentor, chancellor, treasurer, sub-dean and sub-chanter or organist—together with seven other canons, thirteen chaplains and six singing boys.[67]

The Cathedral escaped the wholesale destruction which befell so many ecclesiastical buildings at the unhappy period of the Reformation; the probable reason of this, as before remarked, was its distance from the mainland of Scotland. It was, however, at one time, in danger of demolition from other causes. In 1614 Patrick Stewart, Earl of Orkney, son of an illegitimate son of James V., assumed a kind of independent sovereignty in the island, and when called to account instigated a rebellion which was eventually crushed by the Earl of Caithness. During the struggle the Cathedral, one of the rebel strongholds, was nearly destroyed, and it was only at the earnest entreaty of the Protestant occupant of the see that the Earl of Caithness was induced to spare it.[68]

The revenues, when episcopacy was no longer tolerated in Scotland, having become the property of the crown, it became difficult to provide, from time to time, for the necessary repairs, which in so large a building entailed no inconsiderable expense. Many appeals were made to the government for help, but they appear to have had no result. In 1805 a private benefactor generously provided a small annual sum towards the purpose, and thus it was possible to keep the venerable Cathedral in some sort of repair.[69] In 1845 the government expended some £3,000 ($15,000) in restoration of the building. After the Reformation unsightly pews, galleries, screens and the like had been erected for Presbyterian worship; these were cleared away. During the operations the tombs of two of the bishops were discovered—one of them being that of the very first known occupant of the see, Bishop William. Ten years later it was decided that the choir of the Cathedral belonged to the city, and the Town Council and other representatives at once proceeded to undo all that had been done. The pews were restored, the screen reërected between choir and nave and some of the pillars were actually painted yellow. The finely carved structure known as the "Earl's Pew," on the south side of the choir, probably built from some ancient screen or episcopal throne, was removed bodily, and worse than all, the bones of Bishop William, which again came to light during the alterations, were carted off as rubbish![70]

Since this last "restoration" no further alterations have taken place; the choir, with its unsuitable furniture, still serves the purpose

---

[67] The details of this interesting foundation, the last of the kind before the overthrow of religion, may be found in "Hist. of Beauly Priory," by E. Chisholm Batten, appendix No. XXV. [68] "Ordnance Gazetteer," Kirkwall. [69] Billings, "Antiquities of Scot." [70] "Ordnance Gazetteer."

of a parish church, and though the people of Kirkwall are proud of their ancient Cathedral, they are inclined to lament the cost necessarily incurred for even the decent preservation of so large a structure.

It is a subject for grateful recognition that through all the centuries the body of the martyr saint of Orkney has reposed undisturbed under the shelter of the glorious building raised to his honor by the devotion of the peoples of Europe. It matters little that the exact spot wherein the sacred treasure was deposited can no longer be identified, it has certainly never been molested. May we not hope that like the treasure it contains and on account of it, the shrine also has been divinely guarded—and that with distinct purpose—from the spoiler's hand. It would seem as though the body of the martyr of Orkney, like that of Glasgow's apostolic bishop, Kentigern, had merited the signal preservation apparent in both Cathedrals; may it presage the restoration of the venerable sanctuaries to the worship for which they were built and the revival within their walls of Catholic rites!

Michael Barrett, O. S. B.

Fort Augustus, Scotland.

THE JESUITS AND TYRANNICIDE.

DID THE JESUITS TEACH THE DOCTRINE OF ASSASSINATING TYRANTS?

NAPOLEON, whose searching knowledge of mankind, historic achievements and transcendent genius have not only raised him to the stature of a world's hero, but have given even his casual utterances the impressiveness and authority of oracular truth, perhaps somewhat imperfectly focalizes this latter endowment, when in sententious vigor and philosophic crispness, he tells us that "a calumny once born, cannot be killed." The imperial dictum has the reminiscent familiarity of a decrepit platitude, and with a strange perverseness runs in diametric opposition to a currently accepted truism that truth in spite of all human vicissitudes will, and must prevail. We can hardly picture the mind of the great Emperor so peculiarly constituted, so lacking the elemental intuitions of our common nature, the ripened judgment of the statesman, the innate instincts of the Christian, that he would clothe falsehood in its most pernicious form with the attribute of immortality. Carlyle tells us that the Corsican "has words in him which are like Austerlitz bat-

tles." This is hardly the case here, where we must do violence to the intellect to divest ourselves of a sense of commonplaceness. All the same, he rises to a just and full appreciation of the potency and longevity of calumny. He himself, with the most colossal and puissant enginery ever controlled by human ambition, a ductile substance in his hands, his Promethean proportions looming over the petty royalties like Brobdingnag in the land of Lilliput, disporting himself with crowns and kingdoms with the reckless willfulness of a wayward child tossing about its toys:

> Whose game was empire, and whose stakes were thrones,
> Whose table earth, whose dice were human bones:

surrounded by the bravest marshals who ever brandished a sword, worshiped by the most fearless veterans who ever braved death; his wish an unwritten law, his beck a stern command, his smile a gracious condescension, his frown an impending calamity—who does not know that he winced, smarted, grew livid with impotent rage under the lash of calumny!

We must not suppose that the march of calumny is therefore an unbroken triumph. Its pathway is not unopposed, its vulnerable parts unassailed, its humiliating defeats infrequent, its utter rout unprecedented. But driven to covert, with every visible avenue of escape hermetically sealed, or crushed to the ground in death's agony, like the elusive animal typifying impersonate cunning, it usually vanishes, in more or less attenuated and scotched condition, only to appear chameleon or phœnix-like in disguise or obscurity, not a whit less active, boastful and mischievous.

Probably in no field of human endeavor, not even excepting that of political life, is this more patent, unscrupulous and universal than in religious controversy. That in the heat of polemic strife Christian charity should be chilled, that with the most savage passions of the heart fiercely ablaze, the canons of social amenity should be trampled under foot, that the yawning gulf separating the followers of a common Redeemer should be hopelessly widened, is a melancholy phenomenon. Yet in view of our inherent human weakness, fallible judgment, vacillating will and divergency of temperament it may be measurably accounted for. That error, misinformation and falsehood, however, should cloak themselves in the mantle of religion, even play the rôle of vindicative justice, and with the flimsiest shreds of evidence and utterly discredited credentials invade the sanctuary of truth itself to poison its wells, obscure its light, stifle its voice, and thus propagate and perpetuate themselves, is a spectacle, certainly not in consonance with even the most primitive ethnic conceptions of rectitude, and absolutely subversive, if not fatal to the peace, security, even existence of Christian, natural morality.

In the world of science a glaring error once detected relegates it to the past; in philosophy a fanciful hypothesis once contraverted, ends its career; in politics a sophistic theory once exploded, seals its own death. But in history, especially ecclesiastical history, the detection, exposure and refutation of a great calumny only seems to endue it with a more vigorous elasticity of life.

Burke claims that "rage and frenzy will pull down more in half an hour than prudence, deliberation and foresight can build up in a hundred years." What he here says of the French Revolution can with equal force be applied to historical calumny. One brutal blow of the sledge will shatter the most divinely inspired masterpiece that ever took form under chisel and mallet; one blazing firebrand will shrivel into an unsightly mass of charred paint the most glowing canvas that ever brush or pallet conjured into flushed life; one insignificant train of explosives will blow to blackened dust the most incomparable architectural creation that ever sprang from the brain of genius. It requires nothing more than to paint the radiant seraph in neutral tints or negative colors to divest him of his celestial glamour. Paint him in revolting, black hues, and no oral or written commentary is needful to interpret the new portraiture. In the same way, with even more enduringly disastrous results, a single unveracious historian, with the insidious virus of calumny—pervasive as an infection, can inoculate the whole body of historical writing, and give it a momentum and vitality that

"Lends corruption lighter wings to fly"

and sends it through the centuries in exultant malignity.

If any specific illustration of this truth, involving the prophetic insight of Napoleon's axiom were necessary, one in which the insidious efficacy and seemingly deathless vitality of calumny would be fully and conspicuously exhibited, we need but turn our attention to the historical vicissitudes of the Society of Jesus. From its establishment in 1540—six years before Luther's death—down to the present day, when the Reformer's work has run to seed, it has been the concentrated target at which every delirious fanatic and theological corybant has emptied his quiver of poison dipped darts of senseless lampooning, quenchless hatred and corrosive slander. Not an offense known in the darkest annals of criminology, or hatched in the brain of the most decadent pruriency, but has been laid to its door. Volume after volume, with parasitic fecundity swarmed from the printing press until the *Jesuitica* bibliography forms no insignificant part of the standard library or bookseller's catalogue. Who has not read of the poisoned potion of Clement XIV., the divulged confession of Maria Theresia, the *Monita Secreta*, the instigation of the Thirty Years' War, the Massacre of St. Bar-

tholomews, the obligation to commit sin, the lawfulness of assassinating tyrants, the end justifies the means, the immoral theology of the Society, the assassinations of Henry IV., Lincoln and Garfield—nay, even the last screed of inflaming insurrection in the Philippine Islands? From the strident Seckendorf to the anomorphous Pascal, from the historical buccaneering Thompson to the last despatch of yellow tinged journalism—who has not heard some of these charges rung in major and minor key?

On what basis are these charges usually made, on what historic data do they rest? Invariably on the representation of the sworn, deadly enemies of the Jesuits; with no adducible proof that can be traced to a trustworthy source; with a shameless disregard, if not contempt for the most elementary laws of judicial evidence, philosophic reasoning or historic probability. The guiding principle, in the absence of damaging or criminating evidence, seems to be nothing more than a slavishly yielding obedience to Voltaire's battle cry against Christianity, "*l'audace, et encore l'audace, et toujours de l'audace.*" An old English saw tells us that "an ill name is half hanged," and if the campaign of calumniating mud could have extirpated the Society, it would be buried beyond the reach and power of exhumation. However, Cardinal Newman, on whom these tactics were tried, assures us in that meek wisdom of his that "mud is not immortal," and if a stronger argument were needed to prove the verity of his postulate, we have a most illustrious example in the Society of Jesus.

We propose singling out one of these calumnies, which seems to possess a perennial charm to the Protestant controversialist, and which despite denials and refutations, rotates and returns in endlessly lying repetitions—the lawfulness of assassinating tyrants. A more fitting text could not be chosen for this inquiry than the solemn and explicit reiteration of the charge in our leading American periodical,[1] where the writer, the Earl of Portsmouth, acquits himself in the following recondite fashion:

"The Jesuits were watching," the writer is speaking of the Catholic reaction immediately after the Reformation, "the Jesuits were watching with intense alarm the movement among the European sovereigns to embrace for political and popular reasons, heretical opinions. It is not unnatural, therefore, that assassination, which in those days was the speediest means of altering or checking the stream of political events, should be justified, even recommended in the book *(Suarez, De Fide)*, the object of which is to place the Papacy upon a supreme pedestal of ascendancy both as a moral and a practical force. . . . The Jesuits were not only inspired with

[1] The *North American Review*, November, 1899, p. 726.

the desire to weaken the authority of liberal minded sovereigns, but, when we remember the very remarkable tenets that are contained in a book which was published at the end of the sixteenth century, by Stephanus Hojeda, who was at the same time Visitor of the Jesuits in the province of Toledo, they seem to have evolved, as the strongest basis for Roman Catholicism, the broader democratic principles. . . . In this book, '*De Rege et Regis Institutione*,' it is argued with great subtlety that a sovereign who belonged to the class of tyrant did not possess any claim to the name of 'King;' nor had he any right, having regard to the fact that he had by his conduct placed himself in opposition to the welfare and well-being of his subjects, to possess either the privileges or the respect which belong to the sovereign."

The history of tyrannicide—the term regicide is misleading, and in the specific case under discussion a misnomer—is one of unwaning interest to the student of political history and moral science. It has been so overspread with factitious accretions, painted in such lurid colors, that its true lineaments have been blurred and its historical bearings distorted. It usually reveals itself in an endeavor to give ethical basis and patriotic sanction to a problem of absorbing, even vital interest to the perpetuity of the State and the inviolability of personal rights. Not only in ages when might was right, and grim feudal despotism at times overawed and crushed all law, natural and divine, but even in the full blaze of modern enlightenment, with the widest scope of liberty in possession of mankind, we see it occasionally lose its speculative character, and with woeful results enter the field of practical solution. The bloodstained trails of the tyrannicide can be traced in the history of every nation, civilized or barbarian, Christian or pagan, ancient or modern. Its justification, not as an abstract principle, but as a deed of the loftiest patriotic grandeur, as an imperious moral duty, as a political necessity, is perpetuated in the legendary myths of primitive peoples, discussed in the Christian schools of law, philosophy and theology, and even in our days, when some tragic national calamity brings the ghastly apparition to our attention, is received with mingled sensations of approval and dissent.

The writer of the article peremptorily brushes aside the past history of tyrannicide. He springs it on us as a brand new thesis, the creation of an individual school of thought, fully developed like Minerva springing from the brain of Jupiter, and casts the full responsibility and its accompanying stigma on the—Jesuits. This method of argumentation is not new nor unexpected. While it is devoid of the charm of novelty, the zest of piquancy, or the claims of originality, it usually is effective. Like the wooden admiral resem-

bling Kit Nubbles always threw Mr. Quilp into a paroxysm of rage, the mere silhouette of a Jesuit will always inspire a certain element with lurking suspicion, intensified awe and palsying horror. It smacks strongly of polemic methods, which still appeal to a distinctive type of the Protestant mind: methods "to gain a short, contemptible and soon fading reward," says Milton, "not to stir the constancy and firmness of any wise man . . . but to catch the worthless approbation of an inconstant, irrational, image-doting rabble." The mythologic dragon's teeth had merely to be sown into the ground to leap up as fully armed warriors; the most flatulent absurdity and blood-chilling crime need only be flung at the Jesuits and it will instantly receive the credence of an indisputable fact.

In looking closer at his attitude, it will be seen at a glance that he is treading unfamiliar ground. By attribution he makes one author state what painstaking care fails to verify; by suppression he skeletonizes another only to make him utter meaningless half truths; he ascribes authorship to a man (Hojeda) whose name never appeared on a title page. Finally, and this is really amazing and points a most telling moral, he does not mention the name of the Jesuit nor the work indissolubly identified with the murder of tyrants, the very storm centre of the controversy, and who has been the innocent occasion of exposing "the Jesuits, and chiefly in France"—we are quoting Bayle, their sworn enemy—"to a thousand bloody reproaches and to very mortifying insults, which are repeated every day and will never be ended; which historians will in passion transcribe one from another."[2]

It is not the intention to enter into a detailed history of tyrannicide. The question that now begs solution is, did the doctrine originate with the Jesuits? Were they the first to promulgate it even hypothetically? Can their name be associated with even a shadow of truth with one instance of its practical application?

"States," says Aristotle, "decree the most illustrious rewards, not to him who catches a thief, but to him who kills a tyrant."[3] This may be said to reflect the Grecian mind. "What crime can be greater than killing not merely a man, but a friend? And yet," asks Cicero, "is he a criminal who kills a tyrant though he should be his friend?"[4] This crystallizes Roman sentiment. We can readily picture the thunderous applause that greeted the impersonator of Hercules when in a tragedy by Seneca he stirs the pulse of the

> "There can be slain
> No sacrifice to God more acceptable
> Than an unjust and wicked king."

---

[2] Bayle's Dictionary. Art. Mariana. 2 Lond. ed., 1737. [3] Politics, L. II., c. 5. [4] "De Officiis" iii., 4.

liberty loving Romans by an outburst that comes like a shout from the depths of the great nation's heart:

Garlands of flowers, wreaths of laurels, pæans of triumph, carved statuary, immortal verse was the reward of such heroism. Imperishable fame clusters about the names of Timoleon and Brutus, Hercules and Theseus, Harmodius and Aristogiton. This was the pagan appreciation of tyrannicide.

In the ages of faith, "when those mediæval Pontiffs who had borne aloft the lamp of knowledge . . . who had guided and controlled the march of nations and had been almost worshiped as the representatives of the Almighty;"[5] "when Europe had formed . . . one family united by the bond of religion under the tutelage of the Papacy;"[6] when "without the Roman hierarchy Europe would have probably become the prey of despots, the theatre of eternal warfare, or perhaps a Mongolian desert altogether;"[7] when the Papacy "saved Europe from total barbarism . . . created bonds of connection between the most isolated states . . . was a supreme tribunal" which "prevented and arrested the despotism of Emperors"[8]—during this period despotism and tyranny were counselled and rebuked, restrained and punished by the supreme Spiritual Power. John of Salisbury, in the twelfth century, and Jean Petit, in the fifteenth, may have brought it into some prominence, when it formed with Abelard's *Sic et Non* or Peter Lombard's *Sentences* the subject of metaphysical dialectics, or theological web spinning only to find a summary condemnation by the Council of Constance, 1415.[9]

This tribunal, holding in check despotism, smiting tyranny, vindicating justice, was abolished at the Reformation. In sundering Christian unity, the floodgates of rebellion and anarchy were flung open; in casting off the yoke of ecclesiastical authority, that of civil authority was concurrently repudiated, and we find the very foundation of the social and political fabric shaken to its very depths. "The only event of modern times which can be compared to the Reformation is the French Revolution," says Macaulay.[10] Every lover of the Old Faith was an enemy of God; the higher and more influential his position the more heinous his crime. "It was especially the Judaizing turn of early Protestantism," says Hallam, which made it

---

[5] Lecky, "History of Rationalism," Vol. I., p. 266. [6] Fisher, "History of the Reformation," p. 32. [7] Herder, "Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte," 20 Buch. [8] Ancillon, "Tableau des Revolutions du Système Politique de l'Europe," Vol. I., pp. 79, 106. [9] The following opinion is the one condemned by the Council of Constance, XVI. Session, July 6, 1415: "Every tyrant can and must allowably and meretriciously be killed by any of his vassals or subjects, even by secret machinations or well simulated flattery, without any regard for an administered oath or a previously entered compact, without awaiting the judicial sentence or order of the judge." Mansi, Sacrorum Conciliorum, nova coll., Vol. XXVII., p. 765. [10] Miscellanies: Review of Nare's "Memoirs of Burgley," p. 173.

seek "for precedents and models in the Old Testament, and delighted to recount how the tribes of Israel had fallen away from Rehoboam, how the Maccabees had repelled the Syrian, how Eglon had been smitten by the dagger of Ehud,"[11] that made the new doctrine a covert menace to all authority.

It needs but a cursory study of the Reformation literature to have this truth brought home to us with an evidence as copious as it is overwhelming. Luther, vacillating between prince and peasant, did not hesitate to express himself in language admitting of no ambiguity. The gruff directness and unbridled intensity of his passionate nature stands fully revealed in his reply to the query "whether a tyrant who acts arbitrarily against law and justice can be killed." His answer is: "It is not lawful for a private or ordinary person, who is in no official position or command, to do so even if he can. . . . But if by force he [the tyrant] steals one man's wife, another's daughter, and still another's land, and the citizens unite, no longer able to endure or suffer this oppression and tyranny, they can kill him as they would any other murderer or highwayman."[12] Melanchthon, usually more restrained in language and less violent in manner than his mentor, outstrips him in his justification of a tyrant's assassination. With calm composure, not in a heated work of controversy, but in a well digested compendium of moral philosophy, he maintains: "if a tyrant is a usurper, who has not yet seized the government, they who are confederated to legitimate authority can on their own responsibility murder him like a robber."[13] That he would see his theory an accomplished fact is sadly evident in his letter to Vitus Theodor (1540). "The English tyrant"—he is referring to his fellow reformer Henry VIII.—"has murdered Cromwell. . . . How apposite are not the words of the tragedy: 'a more acceptable offering cannot be sacrificed to God than a tyrant.' May God inspire some hero with the resolution."[14] Zwingli, reputed to be the most temperate and tolerant of the Reformers, does not mince words when he deals with the same subject, which, by the way, he does rather exhaustively. "When by the suffrage and consent of the whole people, or the better part of it," is the Jacobin way he has of putting it, "a tyrant is deposed or put to death, God is the chief leader in that deed."[15] "When Kings rule perfidiously and against the law of God," an allusion and discrimination that needs no comment, "they may, according to the word of God, be deposed. Now that we are so lukewarm in upholding public justice and endure the vices of tyrants to reign nowadays with impunity; justly therefore are we by them trod under foot, and shall

[11] "Literature of Europe," Vol. II., p. 135. [12] Tischreden, Fol. 482, Leipz., 1621; Sämmtliche Werke, Vol. XLII., pp. 201, 202, 206, 207. [13] Corp. Ref., tom. XVI., p. 105. [14] Ibid, tom. III., p. 1076. [15] Opera, tom. I., Art. 42.

at length with them be punished. Yet ways are not wanting," he significantly hints at, "by which tyrants may be removed, but there lacks public justice. Beware, ye tyrants," he is addressing the Catholic princes, "for now the Gospel of Jesus Christ spreading far and wide will renew the lives of many to love innocence and justice; which if ye also shall do, ye shall be honored. But if ye shall go on to rage and do violence, ye shall be trampled on by all men."[16] The inferential, if not direct incitement to revolution, even regicide, is here neither obscure nor ambiguous. Calvin, his hands still dripping with the blood of Servetus, lays down the evangelical maxim: "Earthly princes depose themselves when they rise against God; yes, they are unworthy to be numbered among men; rather it behooves us to spit on their heads."[17] The cowardly assassination of the Duke of Guise (1563) was not only approved, but strong evidence seems to point, encouraged, if not inspired by Beza. "Could I, in the heat of so just a war," he writes, "have known a way either by strategy or violent force to put the Duke out of the way . . . I would not excuse the deed."[18] The assassin, Jean Poltrot, was considered a man of such heroic sanctity that his name was enrolled in the Geneva martyrology. In full accordance with these sentiments, but in more guarded language, is Bucer. "If a sovereign prince endeavor by arms to defend transgressions, to subvert those things which are taught in the word of God, they who are in authority under him ought first dissuade him; if they prevail not, and that he now bears himself not as a prince, but an enemy, and seeks to violate privileges and rights granted to inferior magistrates, imploring first the assistance of God, they should rather to try all ways and means [sic!] than to betray the flock of Christ to such an enemy of God."[19]

More pointed and accentuated is the teaching of the Scottish Reformers. To quote Knox and his colaborers, in the words of Milton "were to insert their whole booke, written purposely on this argument."[20] An extract from George Buchanan reflects the prevalent Reformed opinion, and that he was dealing with a condition and not a theory, the history of Scotland fully attests. He contends that a tyrant "must pass as an enemy of God and man; in my opinion," he continues, "he has as little right to be included among men as wolves and other ferocious beasts. Who kills them does not only benefit himself, but the common weal. If I could enact a law, I would order like the Romans were accustomed to treat monsters—that such men should be taken to an uninhabited country or sank in the depths of

---

[16] Ibid. [17] Calv. in Dan., Vs. 22; Opusc., tom. III., p. 29. Ed. Par., 1633. [18] Schlosser, Theodor Beza, pp. 172-173. [19] Bucer, in Matth., c. v. [20] Milton's Prose Works, Vol. II., p. 40. Bohn's ed.

the ocean, and moreover far from the shore, that not even the pestilence of their bodies need be feared. For those who kill them rewards should be offered, not only by the public in general, but also by individual citizens, in the same manner that we give prizes to those who kill bears or entrap their cubs."[21] It was this book that gave the inspiration and steeled the hearts that brought Charles I. to the block in 1649. The Puritan divines followed in the same footsteps. "The people may kill wicked princes as monstrous and savage beasts," says one.[22] "When Kings or rulers become blasphemers of God," says Goodman, pastor of the English church at Geneva, "oppressors and murderers of their subjects, they ought no more to be accounted Kings or lawful magistrates, but as private men to be examined, accused and condemned and punished by the law of God, and being convicted and punished by that law is not man's but God's doing."[23] "Ungodly rulers," . . . says another, "being without God, ought to have no authority over God's people."[24] "No person is exempt by any law of God from this punishment; be he King, Queen or Emperor, he must die the death; for God hath not placed them above others to transgress His laws as they list, but to be subject to them as well as others; and if they be subject to His laws, then to the punishment also."[25] "When magistrates cease to do their duty," continues the same divine, "the people are as it were without magistrates, yea, worse, and then God giveth the sword into the people's hand, and Himself is become immediately their head."[26]

The attitude of the Reformers could not be summarized more fully and convincingly than Milton does it in his controversy with Salmasius. "You admit," is the well-founded taunt of the irate poet, "that 'some of the Reformers' taught that a tyrant must be put out of the way; to judge who a tyrant is, however, must be relegated to the wise and learned. You do not allude to the Reformers, who so expressed themselves. But I will name them, because you say 'they are much worse than the Jesuits.' They are Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, Bucer, Parens, besides many others."[27]

Luther died in 1546, Melanchthon in 1560, Calvin in 1564, Bucer in 1551, Zwingli in 1531, Knox in 1572, Buchanan in 1582—here then we have the cumulative evidence that the justifiable murder of a tyrant, even a good ruler, if he opposed the "pure Gospel" as taught by the Reformation Pleiades, was not an esoteric doctrine confined to academic speculation, a moot question relegated to political debate, a subject of theological word tilting, but was enunciated with all the pomp and circumstance, sustained and buttressed by the most solemn appeals to Holy Scripture, that invested it with the weight of

[21] De Jure Regni apud Scotus, pp. 50-51. Edinburgh, 1580. [22] England's complaint against the canons, Milton, ut supra, p. 41. [23] Christopher Goodman, Cf. Obedience, p. 139. [24] Ib., p. 144. [25] Ib., p. 184. [26] Ib., p. 185. [27] Joannis Miltoni Pro Populo Anglicano Defensio (prima), c. 1, n. 16 (Londini, 1651).

a defined article of faith. No matter how divergent and contradictory the Reformers may have been in the support of their individual doctrines, we find a most singular unanimity prevailing here.

Now for the first time the Jesuit enters upon the scene. In 1599—years after the Reformers had gone to their eternal accounting—Juan Mariana, a Spanish Jesuit, and not Hojeda, wrote a work[28] which received a most unenviable notoriety and unaccountable odiousness. The work was written at the urgent solicitation of Garcia de Loaysa, tutor to the family of Philip II., and owing to his death before its completion was dedicated to Philip III. It was not intended for the layman, but advisedly and specifically designed as a rule of conduct for royalty, in the same manner that the drafted protocol or the attaché's secret instruction is designed for the diplomatic corps, and not the public. Aside of the intrinsic evidence of the work this is made still clearer by the author's dedication of this great work, "The History of Spain."[29] In it he explicitly states: "In the year just elapsed I delivered to Your Majesty a book which I compiled on the true attributes a King should possess; my earnest desire was that all princes might read and digest it."

Mariana was a man of shrewd political observation, commanding ability, conspicuous piety, in addition to being a distinguished philologist, an authoritative historian and a profound theologian. Above all, he looms up as a man of unimpeachable integrity—an integrity which no court flattery could weaken, a fearless courage which no adversity could dampen, an exalted sense of justice which no royal frown could daunt. The book is characteristic of the man. Prescinding from the one chapter, which made it the target of abuse and denunciation, it is an exhibition of superb statesmanship, a model of equitable legislation, a masterly plea for the imprescriptible rights of the law-abiding subject in his reciprocal relation to the royal ruler. Principal Fairbairn says that "Suarez and Mariana preached strong doctrines as to the duty of kings and the rights of peoples."[30] But the latter did more. While pointing out the lofty dignity, the inherent prerogatives, the vast power of sovereigns, he lays even greater stress on the sacred responsibility, the equitable judgment and paternal solicitude, that must be their inseparable accompaniments. With critical nicety, constructive skill and keen discernment, purged of all pedantry, he deals with every branch of administrative statecraft. The police, courts, taxes, coinage, army,

[28] *De Rege et Regis Institutione, Libri III., ad Hispaniam Regem Catholicum.* The quotations in the article are taken from the Toledo edition, 1599. [29] "Mariana's History" is justly esteemed for the extent of the author's researches, for the general accuracy of his acquaintance with the materials at his command, for the sagacity of his reflections and characterizations, and above all for the merit of his style, which, in its simplicity, vividness and directness, has deservedly been compared to that of Livy." Encycl. Brit., Vol. XV., p. 546, ninth ed. [30] *Contemp. Rev.*, February, 1886, p. 177.

almshouses, theatre—all receive judicious and scholarly treatment. Above all, in clear, articulate, ringing tones is heard the watchword of liberty and the common weal. "The whole work," says Hallam, ... "breathes a spirit of liberty and the common good."[31] In it we find the cry that kindled the fire of American Independence. "The king cannot impose taxes against the will of the people"[32] was here clearly proclaimed before Samuel Adams raised the same cry in Boston in 1764, or the Boston Tea Party brought matters to a crisis, with the same tocsin of war in 1773. Adam Smith could hardly display a more thorough grasp of economic problems; Jefferson could not have been more savage in arraigning despotism, more ardent in advocating liberty, more aggressive in championing justice, more sympathetic in commiserating oppression; nor Franklin more aphoristic in his homely wisdom, more telling in his apt illustrations, more trenchant in his incisive logic, than this maligned Jesuit was in an age of absolutism in the very teeth of royalty.

In the sixth chapter of this noted book he gives synthetic form to his propositions and, with a mind richly stored with classical, legal and Biblical knowledge, subjects them to masterly treatment. What Luther, Melanchthon, Calvin, Zwingli, Bucer, Knox, had answered affirmatively and given the precedent of a finality, going to their graves before this book was published, is now handled in a similar way, in almost the exact terms and language, by a Catholic scholar, but with what results?

To the old query, "whether is is allowable to kill a tyrant," he replies: "If a prince proves to be the ruin of a State, plunders public property, tramples under foot common law and holy religion, and signalizes his career by arrogance, insolence and godlessness," then, after public deliberation and decision to warn him, and all hope of betterment proving ineffectual, he can be deposed. Should war ensue, any citizen has the right of self-protection, and the right to take up arms to kill the attainted enemy of his country. He gives a hypothetical case. "Just the same, at least this is my opinion"—he is never opinionated or dogmatic in his views—"must we maintain in the following case: the State is crushed by the tyranny of the sovereign; the citizens are denied the possibility of public assemblage, but they are determinedly resolved to put an end to tyrannical disorder, to the criminality of the sovereign, presupposing it to be public and unendurable, and by anticipation prevent him from devastating the fatherland—for instance, to deprive it of its religion or place the heel of the oppressor on its neck. When under such conditions some one corresponds to the public clamor and

[31] Literature of Europe, Vol. II., p. 146. [32] Ibid.

attempts to kill him, I for my part cannot look upon him as a malefactor." To bring his illustration to a still more vivid realization, in an inconsiderate and unhappy allusion he recalls the assassination of Henry III. of France by Jacques Clement (1589), then still fresh in the memory of the public. "Most people," he contends, "look upon the murderer as the eternal glory of France; . . . . many think his deed worthy of immortality; other men conspicuous for prudence and learning reprobate it." He dissents with the latter, and though he does not even remotely approximate the bloodthirsty maxim of George Buchanan in maintaining that a tyrant "should be shot down like a savage monster," his conclusion is clear and explicit, that under the qualifying circumstances enumerated tyrannicide is permissible. He again emphasizes the fact that he is individually responsible for his opinion, "which," to use his own words, "I really maintain with a sincere mind; but I am human and liable to error. If any one shall teach me better, he will receive my gratitude."

This, with the omission of some non-essentials, epitomizes the teachings of Mariana which, like the shirt of Nessus, clings to the Jesuits, in spite of protest or disavowal.

Huber, one of the bitter adversaries of the order whose work is still quoted by uncritical and credulous writers, has the confession wrung from him, "if we abstract the doctrine of the permissibility of tyrannicide, the book is the worthy monument of a mind honestly devoted to the best interests of the kingdom as well as to the people."[33] The eminent Protestant pedagogue, Dr. Leutbrecher, who subjects the work to an exhaustive and critical analysis,[34] speaks eulogistically of it. "As a mirror for Princes (Fürstenspiegel) the entire work appears to me to be nothing less than the ripened fruit of a many-yeared study of history; . . . . it is in my opinion better than all mirrors of Princes that have appeared before or since. . . . . Mariana, as seldom happens, means it perfectly honest with the kings. He instructs them in frank and candid language concerning all their rights and duties, in all their relations to the State. . . . . Moreover, Mariana always makes a wide distinction between a ruler and a tyrant: only for the former is the work written; the latter needs no education, moral training, no prudence in governing: besides, such a work is utterly useless for him; . . . . against tyranny he grows indignant, like the just man, who has no fear of death. If I take all into consideration, how much more Mariana by honesty and frankness surpasses the authors of other mirrors of princes. . . . . I can rightly designate it, as the best."

[33] Der Jesuiten orden, p. 247. [34] Der berühmite Jesuit Juan Mariana über den König und dessen Erziehung. Dr. J. Leutbrecher, Erlangen, 1830, pp. 73-78.

Did the book and the doctrine receive the approval and sanction of the superiors or theologians of the order?

The visitor Stephan Hojeda, of the Province Toledo, formally allowed the publication of the work in 1588, it having previously been approved by certain censors to whom it was entrusted. That Hojeda himself read it, or that it fell under the eyes of Aquaviva, the general of the order, until it was condemned by him, cannot be proven, nor is it claimed. But even if the book censors allowed a permit for its publication, it certainly would not represent the collective or authoritative teaching of the order. We might as well reason that the individual brief of a Supreme Court judge exhibits the unanimous opinion of the entire Bench, or the unratified resolutions drafted by a caucus committee represents a constitutional enactment. This Ranke admits with evident reluctance. "The views of Mariana cannot be viewed as a doctrine of the order, much less of the Catholic Church."[35] Grotius fully concurs with him.[36] On the contrary, the strongest evidence is not wanting that as soon as the true character of the obnoxious views became known, the book met with instant condemnation. Aquaviva, the general of the order, took peremptory and summary measures, not only in having the offensive passages suppressed, but in disavowing the supposititious doctrines it was said to teach. In 1605 the Provincial Congregation of Jesuits at Paris censured the work, a censure that Aquaviva ratified by issuing a decree, in which, under the severest penalties, he enacts that no one in the order "should either publicly write or teach, or privately advise, what might in any way tend to the destruction of princes."[37]

Two remarkable and significant facts must likewise be taken into consideration here. That a book which ostensibly contained the most radical, revolutionary and murderous doctrines, subversive to social order, menacing the stability of government, jeopardizing the life of the king, should have met with the cordial approval of Philip III., and been issued under the auspices and warranty not only of the order—*Cum permissu superiorum*—but also under that of the king—*cum privilegio S. C. Majestatis:* that this pernicious doctrine should have eluded the keen scent and escaped the lynx-eyed scrutiny of the inquisitor of heretical pravity of the Spanish Inquisition —a proverbial scrutiny that tradition almost magnifies to a state of omniscience. Again, it must be explained how the suppressed and unexpurgated and garbled work was published surreptitiously in 1605 and 1611—not in Spain, for that could not have been done with

[35] Gesammelte Werke, Vol. XXIV., p. 236. [36] Opera Theol., T. IV., p. 702. [37] Decretum etiam addidit vehemens et grave; ne quis è nostris hominibus aut publice quicquam scriberet, doceretve; aut privatim consilii cuiquam daret, quod in principum perniciem ulla ratione vergeret. Bayle, ut supra, p. 130.

impunity, but in Frankfort and Mayence, by the Huguenot John Aubri, heir of the Calvinist publisher Wechel. They retained the original title, permission and imprint, and this reprinted in spite of solemn denial and vehement protest! In fact, the work would have been as unnoticed and harmless as a school primer, had not the enemies of the Jesuits misrepresented and distorted it in France.

What importance attaches to the condemnation of the University of the Sorbonne may be gleaned from two vital facts, usually minimized or thrust aside. During the domination of the League, the Sorbonne, in common with the Parliament of Paris, declared Henry III. as having forfeited his crown as "a tyrant," absolved all from the oath of allegiance and incited the nation to battle against him for life and death. The same Parliament at Bordeaux actually had a public thanksgiving service celebrated, to commemorate the happy success of the assassination.[38] Now, this same university is urged, if not virtually compelled, to condemn this work, and basing its verdict on this condemnation, Parliament issued a decree (June 8, 1610) to have it consigned to the flames by the public executioner. This ignominious sentence was imposed, not for any tyrannicidal doctrine, but on account of its malicious aspersions on the sacred majesty of Henry III. This is fully admitted by Herzog,[39] but is still more evident from the decree itself. "The court having seen," so runs the decree, "the book of John Mariana, entitled '*De Rege et Regis Institutione*,' printed at Mentz and other places [the unauthorized and pirated editions of Aubri] containing several blasphemies against the deceased King Henry III. of most happy memory; the persons and states of sovereign Kings and princes, and other propositions contrary to said decree. . . . The said court hath ordained and doth ordain that the said book of Mariana shall be burned by the public executioner before the church at Paris."[40]

In fact, it may be safely assumed that this

> doubtful tale from fairyland,
> Hard for the non-elect to understand,

would not have aroused a ripple of comment, that the work would have dropt still-born from the press, that in an atmosphere where every Reformed conventicle was surcharged with the same teaching, it would have died an unobserved and unmourned death, only that its putative paternity was foisted on a member of the Society of Jesus.

But does not the consensus of Jesuit teaching countenance such a doctrine? Are not the most illustrious theologians of the order its ardent advocates? If we were to follow the lead of Dr. Littledale,[41]

[38] Wetzer und Welte's Kirchenlexicon, Vol. VIII., p. 978. [39] Real Encyclopaedie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, Vol. IX., p. 329. [40] Bayle, ut. sup., p. 132. [41] Encycl. Brit., Article, Jesuits.

who, when he deals with the Jesuits spits the venom of an infuriated reptile, and other professional maligners of his ilk, we could arrive at no other conclusion. But if we extricate ourselves from this pestilential quagmire of shameless misrepresentation, escape the mephitic atmosphere of absurd misunderstanding, and with some patience and candor delve in original sources, a most marvelous disillusion awaits us. We merely take the teaching of a few of Mariana's contemporaries of the Society of Jesus, and discover not only that the preponderating sentiment is against his teaching, but that he stands alone, and isolated in its maintenance, one dissonant voice in a chorus of almost unprecedented unanimity. In 1585, thirteen years before the publication of Mariana's book, Salmeron, the distinguished Jesuit exegete, commenting on the words, "there is no power but of God," teaches: "In so far that royal power is derived from the law of nature, it follows that it has its source in God, who Himself is the origin of the natural law . . . the abuse [of power] comes from man." He continues: "It is not the province of the individual to pass a judgment whether rulers possess their sovereignty justly or unjustly. . . . And since we are commanded to obey the rulers and princes without any distinction, even the despotic ones, and this was done by the saints and by Christ, to give us an example meekly to submit to such rulers, even that of the Emperor and Herod, who usurped this authority—in like manner we must obey such authority in all that does not contravene the law of God; for God must always be obeyed more than man. Moreover, it is not allowed to the individual, on his own impulse, to murder a tyrant; at the command of God he can do this (just as God killed Eglon, the King of the Moabites); he cannot do this especially when the tyrant is in possession of the government and is supported by an armed power. . . . If the tyrant, however, issues forth publicly as the enemy of the people, and incessantly perpetrates his wickedness, then he can be killed by any private man, not on his own authority, however, but at the command of the magistrates." Later on he goes further: "It is not against the law of Christ in the Gospel that in the providence of God pagan rulers govern, which was actually the case until Constantine.[42] In 1595 Valentia, a Spanish Jesuit, taught: "The lawful ruler, who by cruelty to his people has become a tyrant, dare not be killed by a private individual. For to call him to a sense of duty is the province of the magistrates, who alone are justified in opposing him and calling the citizens to their aid."[43] Lessius, in the same year that Aubri issued the spurious edition of Mariana, teaches

[42] A. Salmeronis, S. J., Commentarii—Opera omnia, tom. XIII., lib. iv., p. 680-683. For this extract, and those that follow, the writer is indebted to Duhr's Jesuiten Fabeln, Freiburg, 1892. [43] Gregorii de Valentia, Commentatorium theol., tom. III., p. 986. Ed. Luyden, 1609.

still more pointedly: ". . . A prince, although he rule despotically, all the same he remains the ruler. On this account Holy Scripture commands us to obey the pagan rulers as sovereigns in lawful things (thus Rom. xiii., 1; Peter ii., etc.), although they governed most tyrannically, in so far that they persecuted the church, and endeavored to coerce the subjects to godlessness. Therefore such a ruler dare not be killed by any of his subjects, unless in self-defense of one's own life. . . . If the ruler also seized the temporal goods, they are not to be valued so highly that to avert such a calamity it would be allowed to kill him."[44] Becan, in 1608, teaches identically the same, "because the true and legitimate King, even though he rule as a tyrant, all the same remains chief master. On this account Holy Scripture commands us that in all lawful things we are to obey even pagan rulers as our sovereigns, even though they be the greatest tyrants."[45] In 1609 Heiss, a German Jesuit, teaches: "I hold it to be the more probable and common opinion that no private individual, unless it be in an act of self-defense, dare lay violent hands on the lawful ruler, unless on account of state reasons he has been judicially sentenced and declared to be a tyrant and enemy of the Commonwealth. This teaching," he continues, "is defended by Cajetan, Satus, Gregory of Valentia, Leonard Lessius, Louis Richeom, Gretseo and the rest of our Society, in so far that they maintain that no lawful ruler can be killed, even if he oppress the state in a tyrannical way. The same is taught beautifully and comprehensively by P. Emmanuel Saa in his aphorisms for father confessors: 'He who reigns despotically cannot be deprived of his rightful government, much less of his life, without a public sentence.' This is the common teaching of the Jesuits."[46]

Suarez, who is frequently linked with Mariana as a defender of tyrannicide, says explicitly: "I maintain that a lawful prince dare not be killed by a private individual on account of despotic government, or any other crime. This is the opinion of most theologians."[47]

In short, these opinions coincide with the accepted teaching of St. Thomas,[48] and is called the *sententia communis* by Billuart,[49] and it was precisely this protection with which the Catholic teaching encompassed the King, that made one of the shrewdest and most sagacious statesmen declare that "Protestant sovereigns must have

---

[44] De jure et justita, lib. II., c. ix., dub. 4. [45] Opuscula theologica, tom. I., p. 130. Ed. Paris, 1633.

[46] Seb. Heiss, S. J., Ad Aphorismos Calv., p. 162. [47] Defensio fidei catholicae, lib. VI., c. iv., n. 2; Opera omnia, tom. XXIV., p. 675. Ed. Paris, 1859. The author of the article in the *North American Review* quotes this work as De Fide, an entirely different and utterly irrelevant treatise in volume XII. of the same author's complete works. [48] 2 Sent., Dist. 44, q. 2, art. 2, ad 5 tum. [49] De jure et just. Diss. 10, art. 2

lost their senses not to see the absurd folly of supporting a religion which recognizes the right of private judgment and the sovereignty of the people, in preference to another religion which maintains that against our legitimate sovereign, were he a Nero, we have no other right than to allow our heads to be cut off while respectfully asserting the truth."[50]

We need only place these opinions in juxtaposition to those of the Reformers quoted above, to discover which of them reflect the loftier morality, which are more in consonance with the spirit and teaching of our Lord, which disclose the more confident patriotism, which, in short, teach in clear, taunting, inflammatory language the doctrine of tyrannicide. From the assassination of Henry III. in 1589, to that of President McKinley in 1901, can the name of a Jesuit be identified, with even a scintilla of admissible evidence, with a single national tragedy?

All the same the campaign and march of defamation will go on. "They who have read the numberless apologies published by the Jesuits," says Bayle, assuredly no friend of the order, "and will examine them with fairness, will find such an ample vindication of certain occurrences, that every sensible foe must refrain from further charges. However, we need only to allege anything against the Jesuits, whatever the imagination inspires, and we can rest assured that the unnumbered multitude will give it a ready credence."[51]

"I appeal to thousands of men," is the challenge of the oracle of infidelity, Voltaire, "who like myself were educated by them [Jesuits]. Therefore I cannot desist expressing my astonishment that they are accused of teaching a pernicious morality. . . . I make the challenge: there is nothing more contradictory, unjust and disgraceful to mankind than to accuse men of a depraved morality who lead the most austere lives in Europe, and cheerfully go into the face of death in the remotest parts of Asia and America."[52]

The prayer of St. Ignatius for his spiritual children—"O God . . . grant that they may never cease to be persecuted for Thy greater glory"—is, after all, nothing more than a devout realization of that most comforting of benedictions given on the Mount: "Blessed are ye when they shall revile you, and persecute you, and speak all that is evil against you, untruly, for my sake: be glad and rejoice, for your reward is very great in heaven."[53] Persecution is the badge of the Jesuit.

H. G. Ganss.

Washington, D. C.

---

[50] De Maistre, Lettres et Opuscules inedits, p. 39. Paris, 1851. [51] Lettres. Lettre 322 à Mr. Pecher, tom. IV., p. 863. Ed. Amsterd, 1729. [52] Oeuvres complètes de Voltaire, tom. 55, lettre au R. P. La Tour, ed. 1831. [53] Matt. v., 11-12.

THE RELATIONS OF ECONOMIC THEORIES TO IRELAND'S DOWNFALL.

AN interesting article by Mr. M. J. Magee, who was one of the members of the Irish Board of Agriculture,* in the *North American Review* for January last, on the subject of "The Irish Industrial Revival," draws a hopeful picture of the possibilities of a new system recently inaugurated in Ireland with a view to save an industrial condition which may be truly described as *in articulo mortis*. With their long experience of the disappointments resulting from prognostications of a similar kind, from the days of the Earl of Carlisle down to Mr. Balfour and the Congested Districts Board, Irishmen who hope still for the resurrection of their country will hesitate to share the optimism of the writer concerning this particular experiment, which, after a careful examination of its prospectus, seems very like the process of putting new wine into old bottles. If Boards could keep out the winter's flaw of national ruin, no other country on the face of the globe had been in the position of Ireland to resist disaster. It has been an interminable succession of Boards, wearisome as the rise and fall of the climbing waves to Ulysses and his crew, as far back as the longest living memory stretches. And there was not a single Board of all the long array long ago gone into the bottomless pit of failure and oblivion, which did not promise as bravely or make its bow with as good a resolve to do its devoir, for its pay, as the smiling new one, the latest birth of Time, whose programme has been ably put before the American public through the medium of the *North American Review*. All these Boards have been simply expedients such as mariners use to keep their ships from sinking, in foul weather, when the pumps are unequal to the task of expelling the element which has changed from the servant to the master. They only patch up fissures, while the entire hull in reality needs rebuilding. No Board, nor any aggregation of Boards, will ever fill the place of Government for Ireland. A Government means a mind as well as an arm—a heart as well as a head. All that Ireland has ever known of her foreign Government is the arm; head, or heart, or mind has ever, save in the brief episode of Drummond's rule as Chief Secretary, been most carefully kept out of sight.

One simple fact serves to illustrate the illusory character of the

* To the great regret of all who knew him, and to the great loss of the movement for Irish revival, Mr. Magee died before his article had seen the light. He was one of those earnest practical men who, although accepting official position under the British Crown, believe that they can accomplish more good from that fact than they could by endeavoring as private individuals to work out their own ideas for the amelioration of Ireland's unhappy condition.

Board principle as a specific for the desperate case of Ireland, better than a thousand pleas for the claims of fresh Boards. It is the resignation of Mr. T. W. Russell, who, as a member of the Unionist Ministry, was for a good many years joined to the Board which is the Shah-in-Shah of Irish Boards—namely, the Local Government Board, whose permanent headquarters are in the chief British stronghold in Ireland—Dublin Castle. Mr. Russell had long been endeavoring to redeem the promises he gave the electors of South Tyrone when seeking their votes a few years ago, that he would strive for a readjustment of the land code in the direction of fair play for the tenant-farmer, and when he sought to give the promise practical effect, his Unionist colleagues made his place so hot that he found it necessary to send in his resignation, and Lord Salisbury accepted it without any affectation of anguish. So much for the Board system, as it affects the material side of the Irish question.

As regards the spiritual and intellectual side, the case is, however, far more hopeless for those who plead for Board rule as a working substitute for Home Rule. The body called the National Board of Education is charged with the task of moulding the mind of the people, in great measure. The story of its attempt to make loyal non-Catholic West Britons out of three generations of disaffected Irish Catholics is well known as one of the most disastrous failures in all history. Recently, the Archbishop of Dublin, who had for some years been struggling with the task of getting the officials who steer the executive branch of that Board, from their desks in London, to do their duty as it should be done, found his efforts so fruitless that he gave up the attempt and resigned his office, at the same time publicly stating his reasons for the extreme step. And in order to show that the step was deliberate and that he could not be prevailed upon to revoke it by the Lord Lieutenant, he caused the letter to that functionary announcing his determination to be published in the daily press, together with a statement of the reasons which impelled him to resign.

The Board system, under a larger principle, might serve a useful purpose, in a country so circumstanced as Ireland is to-day. That state is in the last degree critical. It is only the nicest handling that can save her from total ruin and chaos. It is not merely ruin to the general population that is threatened: the landed class is equally in danger of destruction, for the fate of both is involved in the issues pending in the immediate future. No other country in the world occupies the anomalous position that Ireland does to-day; and this, even her most ungenerous critics are compelled to own, through no fault of hers, but simply through a combination of causes which lay beyond her power to influence.

To put the position as it is to-day into a nutshell, Ireland is placed between two fires of calamity's forces. While on the one hand the revenue from her landed industries is being perpetually drained, to be spent in England or on the Continent of Europe by the landlord class, the ranks of the toilers who produce that wealth are being constantly thinned, not piecemeal, but in vast volume. America operates on the island as the loadstone rock on the ship in the Arabian Nights' story. It is pulling her population out in thousands yearly, just as the loadstone did the nails of the ship, so that eventually the vessel must fall to pieces if something do not occur to draw her out of the sphere of danger and destruction. To these shores are flying all the wage-earning power of Ireland; those who have youth and energy and adaptability for work and vitality to perpetuate the race are yearly pouring into our seaports, a living tide of fertility for new lands, signifying also exhaustion for the old, and the great ocean steamers are packed with them as fast as they can be placed on the service. And it should never be forgotten that while America is thus draining the island of her best blood, she gives nothing in return. Her seaports are closed against the industries of the country which ought, under more favorable conditions, to be the means of retaining its population at home. The Dingley tariff is a barrier so effectual as to render outside competition perfectly impossible. It acts thus in a duplex way to Ireland's ruin. The bait of the high wages which it enables the country to pay draw the people over with an irresistible force. They never see the other side of the picture. The fact that high wages means an increased cost of living all round is altogether kept out of sight or overlooked; the terrible severity of an extreme climate is never taken into calculation; youth and lusty strength only laugh at such dangers as merely imaginary, and it is so until the penniless immigrant finds himself or herself out of work and friendless, in the keen-fanged, merciless winter or fainting with exhaustion in the torrid summer months. It is only then it is realized how infinitely preferable are privation and poor wages in one's own home, where never are extremes of heat and cold, to stranger lands, where the seasons are as unrelenting as the hearts of speculators in foreign labor. The fate of the Illyrian gladiator dying, far from his rude hut and ruder household, on the sands of some Roman circus, was not more direful than that of the unfortunate Irish immigrant, when sickness or adversity overtakes him or her, in the slums of the great American cities.

This, then, is the economical position of Ireland to-day: Her earnings in money are drained from her by the landlords; they come or they send their agents annually to squeeze out the last farthing with the regularity of the small storekeeper's attention to

his cash register. The people who earn the rents, on the other hand, are annually decreasing in number, and so lessening the ability of the land to pay; the public burdens are growing heavier because of the decrease in the number of those supposed to bear them; the burden of the unproductive class is increasing in direct ratio to the falling-off in the number of wage-earners. And while Ireland gives her best blood to swell the tide of American prosperity, she receives in return for it the high protective duties which bar her wool, her spirits, her bacon and her leather from the American markets; the full force of American competition admitted to British and Irish ports, on a free trade basis, of American beef, American bacon and American sham butter, which, while inferior in quality to her own products, are yet lower in price, and so preferred by the poorer class of consumers—which means the majority.

Now, can any clear-headed person for a moment delude himself into the belief that with such a state of things actually in existence a country can be rescued from imminent ruin by any device such as a Board, or any number of Boards? What is needed for the desperate case of Ireland is a statesman—a man with a heart as well as a head.

Free trade is the direct cause of Ireland's economical plight. That splendid shibboleth of the orthodox theorists, while it vindicated their claims in the case of Great Britain, has proved its one-sidedness no less convincingly in the case of poor little Ireland. Such a statement may appear paradoxical to those who look at Great Britain and Ireland as close-lying members of one small group of islands on the European side of the Atlantic. But nothing is more intelligible when the facts are examined. The factors in the proposition are mainly two. Ireland is almost solely an agricultural country, and produces more from her fields than she can consume—at least on the scale of dietary arranged for her people by her landlord physicians. Her people are forced to live on stirabout and potatoes, while her beef, mutton, bacon and wheat go to the English markets, and the money they realize is the landlords' share of the spoil. While these strange substitutes for the lilies of the field, who neither toil nor spin, might do something to justify their absorption of the country's wealth by living at home and spending the money among the people, they ostentatiously neglect the duty and defy public opinion by betaking themselves over sea with the same regularity as the migratory birds, and only come to Ireland for the hunting season or the time of Dublin Castle festivities.

The Board of Agriculture, of which the late Mr. Magee was an eloquent and intelligent member, was one articulation in a much larger system, the credit of originating which is due to Mr. Horace

C. Plunkett. It is known as the Department of Agriculture and Industries. It is referred to as the outward expression of "the new industrial movement in Ireland," and the objects of this movement, as stated at the outset of Mr. Magee's paper, are such as must commend themselves to all people who admire generous ideals in language, but do not attach much importance to the practical side of glittering propositions. They are these:

"The awakening of a spirit of manly independence and self-reliance, the development of the country's resources, the revival and promotion of trade and industry, the preservation and retention of the people on the land given them by God, the unification of all creeds and classes for the benefit of the community and the abolition of sectarian ill feeling; such are the main characteristics of the new industrial movement in Ireland."

Par parenthese, and prior to any consideration of the means by which it is proposed to have this admirable programme carried into effect, some explanation of the reference to sectarian ill feeling is due, lest readers unaware of real conditions in Ireland might be led into a belief that would be cruelly unjust to the great majority of the Irish people. They might not unnaturally infer, in ignorance of the true state of affairs, that religious animosity is common to all sections of the Irish population; whereas it is notoriously true that it is only in one portion of the island, and that the most prosperous part, that such an animus is found. Among the Protestant people of the North hatred of their Catholic fellow-countrymen is cherished and perpetuated as a sort of historical heritage, and manifests itself at stated periods in murderous outbursts with the regularity of the equinoxes. This unnatural spirit, so far from being discountenanced and repressed as it should be by any enlightened Government, is openly and ostentatiously encouraged and promoted, as a statesmanlike way of safeguarding the permanence of British rule in Ireland, by keeping the country in a perennial condition of division and turmoil. South of the Boyne there is no trace of sectarian rancor. The vast majority of the population is of the Catholic faith, and the few scattered Protestants among them are invariably treated with the utmost respect and kindliness. Adherents of the Protestant Church are often selected by them to represent them in Parliament and on the local Councils. "Sectarian ill feeling," therefore, is a phrase that may mislead. So far as it exists and under present conditions it is beyond the reach of any system of administration short of actual control of Irish affairs by an Irish government. It has been deliberately planted in the Irish system by an alien Government, for a specific purpose hostile to Ireland's well-being, and is deliberately maintained there with the same afore-

thought and malice. It operates through the machinery of the Orange Association, whose nefarious procedure is too well known to the whole world to require any recital here. Since this irreconcilable organization is hand in hand with the central power, it is futile to hope for the abatement of "sectarian ill feeling" through the influence of any such agency as an Irish Board, no matter how beneficent its purpose.

This matter disposed of, it is proper to consider the more practical portion of the programme contemplated by the promoters of the new industrial movement. The references to "a spirit of manly independence and self-reliance" do not seem to be in the best of taste, inasmuch as the first-named appears to reflect upon a people who have sacrificed more as a people for the preservation of national independence and national faith than any other extant; and the second had been sedulously discouraged among the agricultural classes ever since the substitution of English landlordism for the old tribal system of the country, under which the soil was the property of the clan which occupied the territory. Landlordism, which wrested the fruits of the soil from the tiller to an idle incomer, took away all stimulus to "self-reliance," because *pari passu* with the tenant's industry increased the landlords' cupidity, and every acre of soil reclaimed from mountain and morass by the painful toil of the tenant and his family brought not a reward, but a burden of additional rent. The imputation of want of self-reliance, conveyed in the outline of objects of the new movement, is therefore unjustifiable, in so far as it would seem to reflect upon the cultivators of the soil. No doubt it has been placed there innocently, without any desire to blame those who were the victims of a vicious system, instead of the oppressors who sowed the seeds of apathy and indifference. Any one who reads farther on in Mr. Magee's paper will perceive that he at least did not hold the tenant altogether responsible for his faults as an agriculturist, since he had been careful to hint at some of the grievous hardships to which the land system subjected the cultivators, but the darker facts of the case are left untouched. It is only those who had been conversant with the Report of the Devon Commission and the still later Reports of the Royal Commission on which the late Mr. Gladstone based his land legislation who are aware of the absolute ownership over the tenant which the law gave the landlord. Every feature of the frightful feudalism which preceded the outbreak of the French Revolution was reproduced in the Irish social system, so that the Russian serf was far more of a freeman in reality than the Irish tenant-farmer to whom the British Constitution, in solemn mockery, gave a vote, only to have it used against him by his landlord to get the chain of

slavery fastened the more securely about his neck. Woe to the tenant who dared to exercise the franchise in opposition to the wishes of his landlord: the roadside was his certain doom; ruin and death for himself and his family stared him in the face. Self-reliance indeed! As well expect it in the turn-spit or the mill-horse. The uninstructed may take the view that such conditions marked an era long since past: it is proper to inform them that they existed, as a matter of fact, down to a very few years ago, and are not yet entirely non-existent, since many indirect means of coercing his tenant are left in the landlord's hands.

Concerning those items of the programme which might naturally be regarded as free from the element of controversy and entirely practical in design, Mr. Magee's paper invites careful examination. These propositions are as follow:

1. The development of the country's resources.
2. The revival and promotion of trade and industry.
3. The preservation and retention of the people on the land.

None of these objects ought to be affected by other than practical influences. As economic aims, they are each dependent on the working of laws which though unfelt and unseen are as inexorable and sure as the laws of nature. They ought to be simply matters which come within the domain of political economy. But, in the case of Ireland, is it possible so to treat them? It is the praiseworthy object of the new industrial revival to endeavor to rescue the agricultural industries from the danger, which only a few years seemed imminent, of annihilation. With that object an Act of Parliament was passed in 1899 by which a State Department of Agriculture and Industries was established. The amount of money provided for the purposes of this measure, Mr. Magee stated, was a million dollars a year. One million dollars for the resuscitation of a nation, while eight or nine hundred millions have already gone out in the endeavor to crush another one out of existence! A generous contribution truly—when it is remembered that Ireland is being unjustly drained, according to the finding of the Royal Commission on Financial Relations, of about seventeen millions annually, over and above her legitimate proportion of taxation—all for the support of an imperial system in which she has neither interest nor share—save in the way of hard knocks when the fighting has to be done.

When Swift was mad he forgot that the British were the military as well as the civil masters in Ireland and wrote:

> Lo! here's a proof of Irish sense,
> Here Irish wit is seen:
> When nothing's left that's worth defense,
> They build a magazine.

The provision of two hundred thousand pounds a year for the

protection and preservation of Irish industries, destroyed entirely by the direct and indirect operation of English legislation for Ireland, by an alien Government, for a specific purpose hostile to Ireland's bears a remarkable analogy to the building of a magazine for the protection of a place plundered of everything which was worth the taking.

Denmark, France, Holland, Belgium, as well as other civilized countries, Mr. Magee pointed out, possess elaborate Departments of State for Agriculture and Industries. Quite true; but these countries also possess their own Home Governments, and are not administered for the benefit of strangers. One of the most forceful points in Mr. Magee's article is the fact that the success of Denmark in increasing its agricultural output is "the effectiveness with which the Government is enabled, chiefly through organization among the farmers, to come to the assistance of their industry with expert advice, technical instruction and material support." The chief aim of the British Government in Ireland always has been, judging by their legislation and their declarations, to place the Irish farmers at a disadvantage with all foreign competitors and as much at the mercy of a grasping landocracy as it was possible for legislation to do.

In ordinary conditions such undertakings should be regarded as outside the pale of any polemical discussion. But the case of Ireland is peculiar. Differences in race and religion and aspiration spring surprises at many points when the administration of new laws lies altogether in the hands of those who are entirely out of sympathy with the people. It is easy to furnish cases in point, like this: A Board of Technical Instruction is one of the adjuncts of the new Department. Its function is the establishment of technical schools for instruction in various industries, to be carried on with the coöperation of the local councils. Although it is a fundamental rule of the new industrial organization "that neither religious nor political affairs shall be introduced or even adverted to, in the business transacted," the absence from these elements at board discussions by no means insures their exclusion from the practical application of the law when it comes down to matters of detail. How this comes to pass we may gather from the respective addresses of the Bishop of Limerick and the Bishop of Down and Connor, recently delivered before gatherings of teachers and pupils for the annual prize distributions. Dr. O'Dwyer remarked that it was an unfortunate thing that a number of Englishmen and Scotchmen had to be brought over and placed at the head of every department, to impart technical instruction. Perhaps it was unavoidable, but he deplored it. These teachers were non-Catholics, and they knew very little of the country and its people. The educational system

of Ireland, he warned these teachers, was denominational, and if they attempted to set aside the Catholic schools, which had already done enormous work in the way of technical education, and the Catholic clergy, who were their managers, they would make an utter mistake. Nor was there much comfort to be derived from the attitude of the local Municipal Council. As far as any help from that body to the Catholic schools, for the purposes of technical instruction, Dr. O'Dwyer remarked, they might just as well be under a municipality of French infidels.

Here we have indications of danger from two sources, in the seemingly harmless and colorless law on technical education. The attitude of the Limerick Municipality, which drew so bitter a rebuke from the Bishop, is accounted for by the very fact dwelt upon by him in the previous sentences of his warning. Its antipathy to English and Scotch rule is so intense that it will not coöperate, under the provisions of the law, with any system that introduces this element into the sphere of Irish instruction. This is the only rational explanation of a misunderstanding which is somewhat anomalous in present Irish politics.

In Belfast much the same sort of dangers threaten to impede the march of technical instruction, though the conditions vary. The Belfast Corporation are not unwilling to coöperate in the work of technical education, but they want to do it their own way, and this, it need hardly be said, does not contemplate any concession to Catholic sentiment. From a speech recently made by the President of the Belfast Institute, Dr. Henry said he anticipated grave dangers to Catholic interests, and he warned parents that for the present they would do well to keep their children at the primary and intermediate schools, under Catholic teachers, instead of sending them to the places where the plans of the Corporation were intended to be developed. Later on, the Bishop observed, he would indicate the nature of the dangers which he dreaded under the new system.

The general heading under which the subject is proposed—these obstacles apart—is "the revival and promotion of trade and industry." This sounds well and looks well in print. It has done so and seemed so, time out of mind. It was one of the main planks of O'Connell's mighty Repeal movement. The Repeal Association offered splendid prizes for practical essays by scientific men on the best way to effect the same object. Sir Robert Kane won the principal one for a really comprehensive survey called "The Material Resources of Ireland," combined with practical suggestions on the best means of utilizing them. But nothing came from them save momentary enthusiasm. The Home Rule Association and the Land League respectively followed suit, by the appointment of commit-

tees to promote Irish manufactures. These did some good in the way of a partial resuscitation of the woolen industry, but this came too late in the day to prove a national benefit, since the Scotch and English woolen manufacturers, who had the field all to themselves when the Irish trade was killed by William the Third and his Parliament, had perfected their finishing machinery so, and secured the market, in the two centuries of Ireland's sleep, that it was found impossible to compete with them outside of Ireland. Equally hopeless was the idea of finding a market in the United States, where, if the Dingley tariff never existed, the Irish product would be too heavy for general use, besides being too costly by reason of its purity. Cotton is King of the clothing market here, and he will brook no ponderous competitor.

For the present, the utmost that the most ambitious friends of Ireland can hope for, so far as a revival of Irish industries is concerned, is the regaining of the Irish market. Year by year this has been filched away by the inroads of an age of cheap shoddy. English and Scotch shoddy fills Ireland's clothing shops; American machinery ploughs her fields and cuts her corn; American beef and bacon, and Australian mutton, fill her butchers' stalls, while her own vastly superior produce is consumed only by English buyers. Take any ordinary Irish mechanic as he walks Irish streets to-day, and examine what he wears. While he feeds on inferior American canned or refrigerated meat, he is clothed from head to foot in English or Scotch shoddy. The only thing Irish that pertains to his material condition is the draught of native porter or whisky with which he has fortified himself, mayhap, on his way to work or when his day's toil is over. If the new industrial movement can succeed in recapturing the Irish market for the Irish, for the present it cannot hope for more. And as the population gradually dwindles down by the twofold process of depletion of the young by emigration and want of recuperative power in the residuum left behind, the age-spent and the immature, this market must gradually narrow.

It is not in the power of a Board, or a plurality of Boards, to legislate for such a position as this. Only a National Government with plenary powers could hope to do so.

Ireland needs a return to protection. As long as American agricultural produce can be put on her markets, free of duty, in competition with her own, which has paid the uttermost farthing in rent, her hands are tied. As long as trashy stuff from Manchester mills and trashy shoes from Northampton factories are admitted to her markets, to undersell her own sound productions in wool and leather, she must continue to bleed to death.

The system which is called Local Government in Ireland is deceptive in its title. To observers unacquainted with the country's real condition it conveys the impression of adequate powers given to a small portion of the British dominions. In England and Scotland the same phrase means a devolution of power and a wise decentralization. There the central authority seeks freedom of movement in great concerns by asking the people to free it from the responsibility of deciding issues which are of secondary importance. In Ireland it means something very different. It signifies a curbing hand on every petty detail of local expenditure. The only real improvement in fiscal machinery effected under the new Local Government Act is the substitution of popular representatives for the old system of Grand Juries, in whose hands lay the power of local assessments, and whose invariable practice was a bestowal of valuable contracts on their own particular favorites or partisans. This corrupt system after having flourished for centuries, has now come to an end, as all public levies are assessed by mixed bodies of ratepayers and landlords, elected by popular vote, but subject still, in the matter of public expenditure, to the supervision and veto of the central authority in Dublin Castle. But for all greater public purposes Local Government is no more effective than the Gulf Stream. It may put up a parish pump; it cannot give a charter to open a mine or build a railroad. Permission to undertake such improvements must be obtained *from the English Parliament.* The Bill must be initiated in St. Stephen's, and for this purpose a host of lawyers, experts and witnesses must be sent to London, in order to inform a committee of English members what particular thing the particular Irish locality proposes to do; and after all this preparation and consequent heavy outlay the English committee may, and very often does, say it will not give its consent. As long as the British Parliament retains the power to act in this preposterous way, it is idle to dream of any substantial improvement in Ireland's material position.

To illustrate: In the eighteen years of "Grattan's Parliament," when the power of vetoing Irish measures was taken from the English House, and Ireland was free to legislate for her own needs, the great system of canals which may still be seen intersecting the country was devised, begun and finished. Canals, in those days, were what the railways are to-day. They were the great arteries of commerce. Recognizing their indispensability to the progress of the country, the Irish Parliament voted six hundred thousand pounds—an immense sum a hundred and fifty years ago—to be levied off the whole country—for the purpose of their construction. Under the system of Local Government and County Councils no such enterprise is possible. Local jealousies would prevent it. No county

would vote money for an undertaking from which itself might derive no immediate benefit.

Agriculture, in the language of Mr. Magee's paper, is practically the sole industrial pursuit left to the country. It has been so ever since England robbed it of the power to legislate for itself. England deliberately destroyed Ireland's manufactures, for the enrichment of her own traders. And when Ireland was thriving by success of her sole remaining industry, England threw down the barriers which enabled that industry to thrive and flooded the Irish market with foreign grain, grown on land that paid no rent, in competition with her own, raised on rackrented soil. Free trade has been the ruin of the Irish farmer. It is this which has driven the millions of emigrants out of the country. Farming in Ireland, with the hope of profit, became an operation somewhat equivalent to that of pouring water into a sieve. Ireland's trouble is, therefore, quite as much economical as it is physical. She is the helpless victim of conflicting economical theories and systems. The Free Trade system of England and the high Protection system of the United States are to her as the upper and the nether millstones, and she is being ground between them. For some years after the accomplishment of the Union agriculture prospered in Ireland, owing to the long European wars, so as to compensate the country, in a measure, for the simultaneous decline of her manufacturing industries as the result of the migration of the nobility and gentry to London to attend the British Parliament. But as soon as peace was made after the battle of Waterloo, prices of agricultural produce went down with a rush, and ruin overtook many thousands. When the period of Free Trade came with the abolition of the Corn Laws, the ruin was given an infinitely wider area, and the way was cleared for the awful holocausts of the Famine in 1846 and 1847.

If the agricultural system of Ireland be not preserved from ruin by enlightened action, what hope is there left for the country? Since it is, as Mr. Magee declared, her sole prop, must not the whole public come tumbling down if it be cut away? Hence Mr. Plunkett's Agricultural Board may be of some service in enabling the Irish farmers to stave off the dismal hour of final ruin by means of organization and improved methods of farming and the placing of its products in marketable fashion. But, after all, this is but tinkering with a mighty problem. It is an old subterfuge to obscure the actualities of the situation. As long as we can recall, the country has been led on by this Will-o'-the-Wisp phantom, all the time her wealth and her population were being sucked away with fearful rapidity. The Royal Dublin Society has been working for the improvement of stock and methods of farming from time immemorial.

So has the Kilkenny Agricultural Society, the Ossory Farming Society and many other societies that are now only memories. For several decades there was a persistent and most pernicious system of illusion over the results of these societies' endeavors to better the situation. It seemed to be the theory that what benefited the few—the men who raised cattle and the men engaged in the cattle trade—must be a general benefit, while the steady outflow of the people from the seaports was regarded with equanimity, if not with satisfaction as the providential way of disposing of the surplus population. If, as Goldsmith says, that land fares ill "where wealth accumulates and men decay," what must be the plight of a country where, while the population perishes there is no accumulation of money, but a vast decrease? The loss of population to Ireland meant not only an immediate money loss per head, but an indirect loss in the utilization of this labor by competitors for Irish trade. This is a view of the consequences of Irish emigration which is not often perceived. The late Professor O'Sullivan, of Cork Queen's College, has put it very clearly in the course of a valuable book on Irish resources published by the Cork Industrial Exhibition Committee (1886). He says: "The enormous annual emigration of laborers from Europe to North America, *every one of whom* represents an average expenditure of at least *one hundred pounds to the native country of the emigrant,* has enabled the United States and the Dominion of Canada to open up boundless tracts of virgin land, the fee of which often costs less than one year's rent in Ireland. . . . All these favorable conditions of tillage, conjoined with equally favorable conditions of transport, have reduced the profits of corn-growing in Ireland to so very narrow a margin that the better lands have been laid down in grass and the poorer driven out of cultivation altogether."

"Neither religious nor political affairs shall be introduced, or even adverted to, in connection with the business transacted," Mr. Magee's paper states, is the rule of the new industrial organization—a very salutary principle, so far as business meetings are concerned. But this rule does not prescind the consideration, *from outside,* of the important bearing which "religious affairs" at all events exercise upon this eminently practical question.

With the steady obstinacy of an incurable bigot, the British Government denies to Ireland the advantages of a Catholic University. Now it has been clearly shown that without such a University it is impossible for the Irish people to make any progress in the face of foreign competition. It is Science that directs the hand of Labor in the production of those articles which compete with her products, but there is little or no science behind the product of the Irish soil. The blessings of a University flow downward. They permeate all

the community. The arts are taught, and the technical knowledge by which these arts are applied is imparted as well; and gradually the whole body politic becomes a sharer in the blessings which learning bestows on a few. The Irish Bishops have again and again declared their conviction that without a Catholic University there can be no real resuscitation of Ireland's industries; and the facts are year by year demonstrating most clearly the absolute correctness of their prognosis. For the purpose of carrying out Mr. Plunkett's progressive movement instructors in mechanical art have to be imported from England and Scotland, and, as the Bishop of Limerick complains, these persons are entirely out of sympathy with those whom they come to teach, and naturally more or less prejudiced against them; a state of things hardly conducive to real progress. Technical training in England and Scotland is the outcome of university extension. There is no valid reason why Ireland should be debarred from a like benefit, save the blind and miserable bigotry of the Government which holds the country by the throat. "We might even import scientific skill," says Professor Sullivan, "but unless we have skilled hands in the country, or systematically set about training our unskilled ones, manufacturing industry cannot thrive—nay, cannot come into existence in a country."

An obstacle to Ireland's progress that may well be described as perfectly insurmountable is the position of the Irish railways. There is no power on earth, as matters stand at present, that can compel the directors of these undertakings to alter their policy with regard to Irish trade. Ever since these railroads were built their policy has been uniformly repressive, and seemed to have as its objective the encouragement of English trade at the expense of the Irish. Their rates for freight are so high as to be simply destructive of Irish internal commerce. It is almost as cheap to send a cargo across the Atlantic as to despatch one a couple of hundred miles on an Irish railway. One great English line, indeed, controls, it is said, a couple of the Irish lines, and of course things are so managed as to make the interests of the one country entirely subordinate to those of the other. Were there an Irish Parliament and an Irish Executive, its first care would be, in order to stave off ruin, to bring in a measure to buy up the Irish railways and to work them in the interests of the country. Ireland is rich in minerals, yet, owing to the prohibitive policy of the railway companies, it has been found impossible to develope the mining industries of the country to any considerable degree.

A good many years ago an association was formed in Ireland with the object of persuading the Government to buy up the railways and work them for the benefit of the country. A great deal of

evidence regarding the project was given before the Devonshire Commission, and a special report in favor of the project was made by the Right Hon. W. Monsell, M. P. (Lord Emly). But nothing whatever came of it. It is to be presumed that the English railway companies, whose interest it is to have things remain as they are, were able to use their influence with the Government with such effect as to put a stop to the agitation. The directors of these companies exert a powerful influence over the Government. They control a vast number of votes, since their employes number thousands. How can it be hoped that any Agricultural Board, or any other kind of Board, could deal with the obstacle of railway maladministration? The system is ingrained and incurable. Nothing but heroic measures could possibly effect a remedy.

Take the case of New Zealand, where, down to a few years ago, a system somewhat resembling that of Ireland prevailed. Now the colony has the benefit of a plenary Home Rule, and see what a magical change has come over it. Premier Seddon recently summed up the results for the past ten years, in brief, thus: "There has been an increase in the population at the ratio of 19 per cent., in the exports of 40 per cent., in the bank deposits of 60 per cent. The wealth of the country has increased from $5,700 per family to $7,400 —a figure exceeded nowhere in the world. There has been a large increase in the country's debt during the period—to $54,000,000, or $300 per family, but the three-fourths of that amount which are invested in railroads, land settlement, advances to settlers, etc., not only pay interest on the bonds issued therefor, but yield a profit of $300,000 a year to help pay the interest on the remainder. Even the remaining debt is indirectly profitable, as nearly all of it was incurred for new roads, bridges and public buildings, and for the purchase of native lands. During the year just ended the Government reduced railroad rates 6⅔ per cent., in pursuance of its policy to reduce these rates whenever the reduction could be made; and the roads still net the Government enough to pay the interest on their bonds. Instead of causing a deficit this cut in rates was followed by such an increase in traffic as to yield the Government more than ever before."

Now, if all this progress is possible at the antipodes, what might be the case of Ireland under an enlightened Home Government, with all the advantages of propinquity to the English and Continental markets? She would, in that case, be a powerful buttress and support to England, instead of being as now the "tendon Achillei" to the unwieldy Empire. The more closely the position of Ireland is studied the clearer it becomes that ruin is inevitable if the existing economical conditions be not modified in the near future. The

first necessity of the case is protection for her industries if they are not to be wholly annihilated. To that end the creation of a Home Government is absolutely indispensable. The work of the ill-starred Act of Union must be all undone if the country is to be rescued from the abyss of bankruptcy.

No better illustration of the inefficiency of any system short of complete decentralization could be afforded than the case of this British colony and the other chief British colonies. As long as they were held in leading strings they languished; once emancipated from London red-tape their progress was that of young giants. There is not a single argument that makes against the manumission of Ireland that was not applicable to the colonies, as long as their position was one of dependence on Downing street. Their discontent might have been utilized by an enemy as a means of striking at the power of the Empire—just as Ireland's discontent menaces its safety today. A wise liberality in policy was substituted for the old miserable jealousy and niggardliness, and lo! the whole scene is changed as if by magic. The liberated colonies become the loyal and devoted ramparts of the Empire. Can any one doubt that a similar transformation is possible in the case of Ireland? Humanity, in regard to its material interests, is much the same all over the area of civilization.

It is not to decry the importance of Mr. Plunkett's movement to say that of itself it is inadequate—entirely inadequate—for the regeneration of Ireland. It has done, and can do, much in a practical way toward preventing immediate and general collapse. It cannot possibly, under the present broad economic conditions, do more than help the remaining handful of people to keep themselves from total beggary by utilizing such resources as they find to hand. But what a task lies before the Irishman who aspires to place his country on the same industrial plane that she occupied ere English competitors began to scheme for her ruin. That work took nearly two centuries to accomplish. Can any one hope to undo its awful results in a lifetime? Were the Government at last to let the scales drop from its eyes and allow the Irish to manage their own affairs, such an organization as Mr. Plunkett's must be a most valuable agency for the revival of industries, because of the information it would have been enabled to collect and the experience it had acquired regarding the most effective fields of action. But if its effect on the mind of Ireland were to divert the country from the larger aim of securing control of her own resources, then the policy of supporting it could hardly be considered as the true line of patriotic duty. So far as can be seen, however, this danger is infinitesimal. There seems no

distinct line of cleavage as yet between the industrial problem and the higher national one.

One of the first needs of Ireland, in order to have any industrial revival, is a law making trades disputes subject to compulsory arbitration. Such a law is now in operation in New Zealand, and has been found eminently conducive to the welfare and quiet of the country. Strikes have been in Ireland the fruitful causes of disaster. They were encouraged, in many cases, by English manufacturers who coveted the trade. Agitators were paid to go to Ireland and incite workmen to strike. Many industries were killed by this means. Once driven out of the country they never returned. In addition to these subterranean methods of undermining Irish trade, Parliament was constantly enacting laws, in obedience to the pressure of English manufacturing corporations, for the hampering and strangulation of Irish industries. Mr. Froude, who cannot be charged with any particular bias in favor of fair play for Ireland, is one of the most eloquent witnesses on the persistency and thoroughness with which this policy of strangulation was applied. Is there any difference in the disposition of the England to-day—any manifestation of a desire to atone for a long course of deliberate wrong toward a country which she had forced into a ruinous pact for the surrender of her liberties and her interests into her hands? Not the smallest vestige. Her policy is invariably just as narrow, selfish, and pitiless as when she was passing her Navigation Acts and her Acts for the suppression of the Irish woolen trade.

It is the purpose of the Government, as announced in the King's speech on opening Parliament, to introduce a new Land Bill for Ireland. As this measure, however, does not contemplate any compulsory buying-out of the Irish landlords, not much can be hoped from it, since the Irish tenant farmer cannot possibly compete, while paying a heavy rent, with the American producer, who pays a nominal one. As there is some disposition in England to recede from the principle of free trade, in that direction there would appear to be some better reason for hope. As long as England maintains a free trade system, and as long as high protective duties bar Ireland's products from foreign markets, her case can be little improved by any effort of her own, even under a Home Rule Government whose hands were not perfectly free to deal with her fiscal position according to her desperate necessities. If Canada, New Zealand and Australia be permitted to legislate on such matters without danger to British stability, it is difficult to see why Ireland should be denied the right of protecting her own interests in the same line.

An Industrial Exposition will open in Cork in the course of a few months. Advantage might well be taken of the occasion to hold a

great economic council. The best and wisest heads in the country could be brought together to devise means whereby it might yet be saved from final shipwreck. The danger is appalling. In the last extremity the British Government may come to realize that what saved the colonies to the common defense may yet save Ireland also. Until this is realized, Boards may come and Boards may go, but Ireland must continue to sink under her deadly hemorrhage.

JOHN J. O'SHEA.

THE NEW LANGUAGE DESPOTISM IN THE PHILIPPINES.

THE regulation of a people's language by statutes is essentially a modern idea in politics. Outside the political world it is still regarded, by thinkers, as a matter which nature regulates in her own way as she does the succession of the seasons and the growth of harvests. Human usage, as the old Latin poet of Augustus sang, is still the cause, the law, and the judge of every form of human speech. However, political activity has, of comparatively recent years, undertaken to mould language to the convenience or policy of governments in certain countries. The idea is probably an outgrowth of the other modern one that the thoughts and schooling of men may be regulated by legislation. It is remarkable that both these ideas have been brought forward almost simultaneously with the abandonment of the system of state formed religion which had been in vogue in most Protestant states since the time of Luther. It looks as though the human mind could never rest from experiments in the matter of government, however unfortunate the result of previous attempts of a similar kind.

Two great Governments in Europe are now, and have for some years back, been engaged in the policy of making language subordinate to state interests. In both the state interests are regarded by the administrations as identical with absolute rule of the sovereign. In the larger, Russia, the autocracy of the Czar has almost the force of a religious dogma. In Prussia, indeed, representatives of the people form a part of the general government, but the King, with complete control of the army, and the traditions of two centuries of absolutism to support him, openly maintains his claim to supremacy in case of divergence of opinions between himself and the popular representation. The title of "War Lord" so commonly put

forward by the Kaiser of Germany indicates sufficiently his belief in his own autocracy whenever its assertion is needed. Both Czar and Kaiser have decided that the languages which their subjects may speak is a matter to be determined by the sovereign's will or whim. Diversity of speech has existed both in Russia and in Prussia from time immemorial. Nicholas II. and William II. have decided that they do not wish it to continue. In Prussia the Polish population of Posen, of West Prussia and Silesia have been ordered to forget the tongue of their fathers and learn that of their German conquerors. In Russia Poles and Germans alike are bidden to adopt the language of their less civilized Russian fellow subjects under penalty of the law.

Tyrannical as such an exercise of arbitrary power seems to men used to the liberty of free Christian states, it is at least in keeping with the traditional despotism of Russia and Prussia. Peter the Great regulated the beards of his Russians by imperial decree and substituted a semi-military board for a Patriarch as head of the national religion. Frederick of Prussia prescribed the amount of money which any class of his subjects might carry when traveling, and where each man might attend college. His father employed the public revenues in gathering a regiment of giants and trying to perpetuate the race in his dominions by marriages with wives of similar stature. Where the power of the sovereign could be thus exercised without resistance it is little wonder that the authority to regulate language and religion should be claimed. Neither Peter nor Frederick, it is true, attempted the latter task, but it was because their individual tastes lay otherwise. Peter despised his native Russian as a dialect of savages. Frederick disdained his own German speech as only fit for the use of peasants. French was the chosen language of both these older despots whose modern representatives are engaged in forcing on other nations the languages despised by their own ancestral despots. The policy is at least consistent, in as much as it assumes that the will of the monarch is the highest law. But what is to be thought of a similar policy of state regulation of language when put forward by men claiming as their motive the spread of American ideas of popular liberties? Moreover, these gentlemen are not monarchs by divine right or hereditary appointment. They are not even trained in the administration of governing in any community. They are simply five revocable employés of the American administration, selected by the late President at his own discretion from judicial appointments, the practice of American law and obscure chairs in new universities of the western states. The sentiment of despotic power must indeed grow fast in office, when Messrs. Taft, Moses and Worcester, after six months' residence in a new land, can lay down the new theory that instruction

in the native dialects is not desirable for seven millions of people, and that compulsary education in English is necessary for the moral and social elevation of the Philippines.

How new the theory is the Commissioner who was taken from a chair of history in the State University of California ought to know at least. It may be that the interests of his fellow pedagogues obscured his intellectual vision, or he could not but be aware that all through the course of history even the most autocratic despots have abstained from interference with human liberty in the use of language, and that on the simple grounds of its danger to their authority. In the great empire of the ancient world the Roman Cæsars made no attempt to force the Latin tongue on the inhabitants of the provinces. Greek continued the official as well as the popular language east of the Adriatic until finally it supplanted Latin as the official tongue of the Eastern Empire. The old Coptic of Egypt survived the conquests of both Greek and Latin, the Hebrew of the Jewish race did the same through all the severities inflicted on the despised Jewish race. When the Western Empire had lasted four centuries the Christian St. Augustine had still to preach in the Panic tongue to his people and St. Martin in that of the Celtic Gauls. The barbarian chiefs who came as invaders to build up kingdoms on the Roman territory followed the same course. They seized the lands and plundered the cities of the conquered peoples, but they did not interfere with their language. Theodoric and Clovis called Roman statemen to help in organizing their new kingdoms. The languages of modern Europe are a proof that through all the convulsions of eighteen centuries speech, at least, of men has been left free by political despotism, and been regulated in fact, as well as in theory, by the influence of its natural laws of development alone.

Its rights were respected even by the Asiatic hordes who brought the creed invented by Mahommed to give sanction to the despotism of Caliph or Sultan. The Christians of Spain were not required to adopt the language of Arabia when the Court of Cordova was the centre of Arabic culture, and the native language still a dialect as uncultivated as that of the Tagals or Visayas of our own day. The Sultans of Turkey did not impose restrictions on the speech of the various races that bowed submissively to their law. Arab and Kurd as well as Christian Greek or Armenian was left to use the tongue of their fathers and to bring up their children to cherish its use, as freely as they were left to sow and reap, to wear turban or toga as their taste desired. It is certainly remarkable, in an age which boasts of the growth of personal liberty, encroachments on natural individual rights should be put forward as policy of government.

Something similar indeed may be noted in the matter of state

regulation of religious belief. The Roman Emperors had tried to regulate religion by political law and had to confess their failure after a series of experiments lasting from Nero to Diocletian. With the intellectual development of the European renaissance the ambition of rulers to regulate the beliefs of their subjects was revived. Luther's maxim, "Cujus regis ejus religio," is a bold assertion of the claim of the Cæsars of Rome that the Emperor's sanction was required for the practice of Christian rites. The King in England, the Magistrates in Massachusettts, the Electors and Margraves of every German Protestant state all claimed the power to form the beliefs of their subjects in matter of divine revelation. They assumed this authority even while respecting in other points the maxims of statecraft of Macchiaveli and Bacon, which pointed out the risk of extending despotic control into the daily lives of even a submissive people. The pretensions of rulers to regulate religion at least as far as forming one for official recognition alone have been abandoned in most civilized lands. Are they to be followed by pretensions to regulate popular language?

There are grounds to fear such may be the case. State interference in details of private life which had been left free even by the most reckless despots of other times became a feature of European governments in the eighteenth century under the influence of the philosophy which tried to substitute human science for Christian morality as the guide of society. The half savage Peter of Russia was the first ruler to lead the way in this new direction. Several of the German sovereigns followed, like the two Fredericks of Prussia and later Joseph of Austria. It became fashionable to attempt the character of "enlightened despot" of enlarged ideas and to regard the common people as fitting objects of experimental social science. Voltire and his fellow wits sneered at the national heroes of their own country while they lavished flattery on Catherine of Russia's despotic measures of supposed civilizing influence or Frederick's conquest of Silesia. The school of unbelieving philosophers that dominated public opinion in France and England alternately applauded and mocked the different projects of social regeneration put forward by their crowned admirers. Voltaire satirized Frederick's pettiness and Frederick sneered at Joseph's meddling in the religious practices of his subjects. "My brother the sacristan" was his favorite term for the Austrian ruler when the latter had entered on his career of innovations. The disturbances which followed in Belgium and Italy before the French Revolution were a practical object lesson of the folly of Joseph's reforms in a sphere outside his own. Though European races would submit to be taxed or led to war at the will of a monarch, it was found that there were limits to their

submission when their social life and religion were made the matters of his interference.

The use of national languages was one of the matters in which human liberty was left undisturbed through all political changes down to the French Revolution. There had been many changes in the boundaries and forms of government of European states since the close of the middle ages, but the languages that then existed continued to be spoken as before. In that point no conqueror thought of interfering. When Louis of France added German Alsace and Spanish Rousillon to his dominions he left his new subjects to follow their own discretion in that matter. The variety of tongues used within any state was regarded rather with pride than otherwise by its rulers. Mazarin founded the College of the "Four Nations" in Paris as a natural and politic recognition of the distinct nationalities incorporated into the French monarchy under his administration. The absolutism of Louis made no attempt to disturb the social life or language of his subjects, even while the French language itself was spoken in every court of Europe and recognized as the international language of diplomacy and culture.

It was the same everywhere else on the European Continent. Belgium, Naples and Lombardy were parts of the Spanish monarchy for nearly two centuries, but no attempt was made to displace Italian or Walloon by the Castillian language. In the courts and administration, as well as in common life and the schools, the native languages were everywhere recognized. In Austria, Magyar and German, Slavonian and Romanian, continued to use their national speech under the government of a German Emperor as they had done under their national sovereigns. In Poland and Switzerland, republican institutions respected differences of language among their citizens as naturally as any of the other liberties which they esteemed it their special glory to maintain. The unity of the Polish Republic was not held to be impaired because Lithuanian was spoken beyond the Niemen, or Ruthenian south of the Prypet. French Geneva and German Uri united with the Italian Grisons in a common nationality without seeking to force a common language on their citizens. They still remain united for all political ends as closely as any nation of the world.

In the face of these facts it is interesting to trace the origin of the movement for enforced uniformity in national language which has sprung up in several countries of late years. Russia since 1863 has been putting all its power at work to root out the Polish language from the Czar's dominions, though it is used by the most intelligent and civilized portion of the subjects of the empire. Prussia for the last fifteen or twenty years has been similarly engaged in Posen and

West Prussia. England is trying to supplant Italian in the Maltese courts by her own foreign tongue, and a section of the politicians of our own land are working strenuously to change the languages of the Tagals and Visayas of the Philippines for English. One asks with some wonder whence has come this sudden impulse for subjecting the languages of men to state regulation.

It may be traced, we believe, in its origin, to the military dispotism into which Napoleon organized the general upheaval, political, religious and social, of the French Revolution. A mania for regulating society on scientific principles had found favor during the domination of the first Republic which took the place of the monarchy of the Bourbons. The old provinces of France with their Parliaments and local laws, the old independent universities and systems of education were all swept away as ruthlessly as the monarchy and the Church. Local boundaries sanctioned by tradition and custom had to give place to departments laid out on mathematical principles of surveying. When the successful soldier became absolute ruler of revolutionized France he accepted in part the ideas of the theorists whom he had displaced. He used as much of them as tended to the strengthening of his own personal power. The state control of schooling was in his eyes, as in those of the Prussian Frederick before him, chiefly useful in securing a military uniformity in the ideas of all Frenchmen. The ambition of Napoleon to be able to tell what every child in France might be studying at any hour of the day exemplifies at once the object and the dangers of this system which was dignified by the name of public education. It meant that the drill which is suitable specially to form soldiers should begin with the cradle, and military efficiency, not social development, should be the great end of the whole national life. The public schools, it was the despot's hope, would give him the same control over the minds of Frenchmen as Mahommedan beliefs gave to the victorious Sultans of the Osmanlis.

These ideas were too favorable to absolutism to be neglected by the monarchs of other European countries after the fall of Napoleon. Metternich, the Minister of Austria who filled a place during the thirty years after the Treaty of Vienna like that of Bismarck at a later time, took up the Napoleonic ideas in the point of public schooling. They were adopted by the other German sovereigns and to a limited degree by the rulers of Russia. What should be taught in school and university had before the French Revolution been left to the free will of the public and the skill of individual teachers. After the fall of Napoleon it grew more and more to be reckoned among the police forces of the government, especially in the absolutist monarchies of Europe. Mental development had been left

free to find its own methods and objects alike by Roman Cæsarism, the feudal lords and the rulers of the centralized nations of Europe down to the French Revolution. The Republic of Letters was a fact as well as a name. The universities of France and England, of Spain and Germany moulded each its own subjects and methods of instruction according to the abilities and judgments of its learned members. It was not supposed that learning could be promoted by being mainly directed to political ends. The centralized University of France showed how schooling might be made an engine of absolute government, and the lesson was readily taken by absolute rulers. In Austria and Prussia the traditions and corporate influence of the old university bodies were too powerful to be attacked openly, but the interference of the political authority in the lower schools was introduced to a degree before unknown. In Russia the whole system of education was subjected to as absolute a military rule as even Napoleon could have desired. The only object of intellectual development in individuals there is to provide the government with trained servants for its various departments. The ideas of state regulated education have since spread to lands which do not recognize the value of personal despotism as a system of government. It is well to remember that their first development on a large scale is due to the genius of a soldier who aspired to dominate Europe by higher military training of his subjects. State uniformity in schooling and thoughts of citizens or subjects is certainly conducive to such an object, but there are many who will refuse to accept such an object as the chief end of national existence.

The regulation of schooling to uniform standard by political laws naturally suggested further extensions of political activity. If state directed teaching can make all men think alike, why should it not also make them speak alike if the governing authority so wills? Napoleon was not responsible for this last development of his methods, but it has grown naturally from his ideas. The War of Culture of Bismarck and the Russian campaign against German and Polish language are alike developments of Napoleon's state control of education.

The idea of regulating national languages by law may be said to have originated with the Austrian Minister Prince Metternich after the Treaty of Vienna. Metternich was the dominant spirit in the Congress which arranged that settlement of Europe and for thirty-five years afterwards his influence and personality were as influential as those of Bismarck after Sedan. Though a bitter foe of Napoleon personally, the Austrian statesman cordially adopted the lessons in intelligent despotism given by the French Emperor. He aimed to give Austria military power like that of France under

Napoleon, and he was ready to sacrifice every consideration to that. A complete centralization of the various nationalities which made up the Austrian state seemed important for that end, and the introduction of a common language appeared the readiest means to bring such a centralization into fact.

The condition of Austria is peculiar among the Powers of modern Europe. It is a government, but not a nation in the same sense as France, Germany or Spain are nations. It is a union of many distinct races, under a common head, but it has been formed not by conquest but by successive coalitions in which each country preserved its own national existence while uniting in a political league for mutual protection. The formation of the modern Austrian Empire has more points of resemblance to that of our own Union than it has to any European model. In the sixteenth century the Slavonian kingdom of Bohemia and the German Archduchy of Austria chose the ruler of the last as their common sovereign, while each retained its domestic self-government. Moravia and Bohemia had already been united by a similar bond. A generation later, when the Hungarian monarch Louis perished on the field of Mochacz, the necessity of defense against Turkish invasion made the Hungarian Diet elect the Austrian Archduke as King of Hungary, and the law of hereditary monarchy has continued the union to our own time. Smaller countries, the Tyrol, Styria and Carinthia, were similarly united on terms of local home rule with the dominions ruled by the Archduke. At the Treaty of Utrecht, Lombardy and Belgium, which had till then been united with Spain, in a similar bond, were joined to the territories of the House of Austria. The union of states thus formed was modified only slightly during the eighteenth century and the Napoleonic wars. Polish Silesia was separated from the Austrian dominions by Frederick of Prussia's conquests, and Polish Gallicia was added to them by equally lawless force. In the same way Belgium was taken away, and Venice and Dalmatia added as members of the Union in the nineteenth century.

This union of many nations under a single ruler had no political name down to the end of the eighteenth century. It was simply the "dominions of the House of Austria," not an Austrian nation. The Archdukes, from the time of Charles V., were chosen Emperors of Germany almost as a matter of course, and that was the title usually given to the ruler of the Austrian dominions. His title was drawn from a land over most of which he had no political power, his real power from countries which gave him no common title of sovereignty.

When the old German Empire was dissolved by the Treaty of Presburg its last ruler assumed the new title of Emperor of Austria.

It was then, for the first time, that the name of the small archduchy which had hitherto been only a German province was applied to the whole body of state that recognized the Archduke as their hereditary sovereign. The constitutions and mutual relations of these states were not changed. To Hungarians the Emperor of Austria was still only the King of Hungary within that country. The rest of Europe, however, gradually came to regard the new name as a national designation. Hungarians, Bohemians, Gallicians and Croats were called by the name of Austrians outside the bounds of the empire.

Metternich, after the Congress of Vienna, desired to make this artificial union of different countries a centralized nation like the France of Napoleon. In population and territory it was not dissimilar, but for military purposes the half dozen nationalities of Austria could not compare with the power of centralized France. It was the aim of Metternich to fuse those nationalities into one, in institutions and national sentiments as they were already united for defense under a common ruler and political name. For that he began by trying to force a common language on all Austrian subjects regardless of their origin or history.

That language he decided should be German, as it was that of the Court and Emperor. It did not matter, in his judgment, that German was a foreign tongue to three-fourths of the population of the Empire. To him, as to Hamilton and Jay in the early days of our own Union, a strong central government was the most essential point for national existence. As Hamilton would have liked to reduce the various States of America to the dimensions of the smallest among them, so Metternich applied himself to sub-divide politically the different countries which make up the Austrian Empire. He sowed division between Croats and Magyars in Hungary, between Ruthenians and Poles in Gallicia, between Germans and Czechs in Bohemia. In the meantime he steadily pushed the German language into use everywhere in the public service, the army and the schools. For some years it looked as if his policy might succeed. German was spoken commonly in the cities of Hungary and Poland to the exclusion of the national tongues, which were officially treated as mere provincial dialects. The local institutions were modified on new models, stamped with a uniformity like that of the Code Napoleon, and praised by the official press as the products of enlightened civilization. In the universities of Bohemia and Hungary the language of the court was the common channel of communication between teachers and pupils. In science, in literature, among professional men, courtiers and officials, it looked as though the opinions of Vienna were dominating every part of the Austrian Empire as Paris rules public opinion in France.

How deceitful these appearances were was shown within a few years. Kossuth, in Buda Pesth, took up the advocacy of the language of Hungary as a patriotic duty and the Magyar population responded to his call. In other parts of the Empire similar feelings were evoked. The scientific centralization of Metternich, instead of consolidating the various races into an artificial nation, stirred their feelings and differences into mutual hostility. The old union of many nationalities under one head had been sufficiently strong to repel the power of Solyman and humble the pride of the Grande Monarque of France. It had kept itself unbroken through the wars of Frederick of Prussia and Napoleon, and had come out of the struggle with the last in triumph. The policy of Metternich, in seeking to obliterate the various national languages and institutions, brought the whole Empire to the verge of destruction in 1848. The population of Vienna rose in revolution in imitation of the Paris of Louis XVI. and nearly every other section of the Empire followed in the same course, but with different aims. Hungary separated absolutely from its old allegiance. Venice restored its old Republic and Milan invited Carlo Alberto of Sardinia to receive it into his dominions. The army on which the policy of Metternich had relied shared the same national impulses as the populations. The Hungarian regiments threw their lot with Hungary, the Italian with Italy. The Emperor Ferdinand resigned in desperation, and it was only by calling in the aid of Russia that the Austrian monarchy was saved from destruction.

With that help against the largest division of the Empire, and the flight of Metternich, the crisis was passed, but the jealousies excited by the crusade against national languages and institutions remained. A few years later Lombardy was again detached from the Austrian dominion by Napoleon III. and Venetia a little later by the combined forces of Prussia and Italy. The Austrian Emperor recognized the impracticability of bending national feelings to political ends by force, and frankly acknowledged it. The separate national governments have all been restored, and Federal Union, not a centralized government, is now the law of Austria's national existence. The lesson is one worth noting in other countries which may feel inclined to seek strength for aggression abroad at the cost of self-government at home.

Metternich's attempt to suppress national languages by political agencies found imitators in the neighboring military monarchies. Prussia, though the large majority of its population are of German race, has a large Polish element in its dominions as a result of the conquests of Frederick. In Posen, West Prussia and Silesia the Polish race is the large majority, and it has been the steady policy of

Prussian Kings to encourage the immigration of Germans into those provinces and to displace the use of the Polish language. The present Kaiser continues this policy in both its branches actively. In all the public schools German is made the vehicle of instruction even for children whose parents have no knowledge of any tongue but their own. Quite recently, in the village of Wretschen in Posen, a number of mothers of families were sentenced by the German courts to long terms of imprisonment for protesting against floggings inflicted by Prussian teachers on their children as a penalty for their incapacity to understand the state language. Even elementary religious teaching is only allowed to be given in the foreign tongue. The natural result of ignorance of essential duties of life and citizenship is counted no importance by official wisdom in comparison to the introduction of a new form of speech. The coercion is extended to the courts, the post office, the police, the railroads, the naming of streets and every other institution or practice which can be reached by political despotism. Though the campaign against Polish nationality and language has been now kept up during nearly a century, it does not appear to have attained any measurable success as far as the objects aimed at by the government are concerned. Very lately, in the Prussian Parliament, complaints were made that the Polish population was not merely keeping up proportionately with the Germans of Prussia, but was actually increasing its relative strength. The only effect so far has been to embitter the hostility between Germans and Poles on national grounds and to stimulate the activity of the Polish press and literature. Dislike of the government in general is daily growing among the Polish element in Prussia and is a serious danger in the possible event of a war with the great Slavonian power on the eastern border. When one compares the loyalty of the German population of Alsace to France with the hostility of the Poles of Posen to their German masters it is impossible not to be struck by the contrast. German Alsace was separated by force from the German Empire over two hundred years ago. For three-fourths of that time international wars came regularly to keep up feelings of national jealousy between Frenchmen and Germans, yet the Germans incorporated with France became the most loyal of Frenchmen. In Hungary, it may be added, in like manner the German "Seven Cities" of Transylvania were among the most devoted citizens of Hungary in the revolution of '48 against the German monarchy at Vienna. In Prussian Poland there was no friendly nation beyond the border to keep alive the feeling of nationality among the annexed populations. Russia, though Slavonian by race, has always been the national foe of Poland, and the Czar's despotism is as hateful to Polish ideas, at

least as Prussian absolutism. Still the Prussian Poles to-day are thoroughly hostile to the government and institutions of the kingdom of which they have formed a part for four generations. How comes this difference between them and the Alsatians and Corsicans incorporated with the French population? The answer would seem to be that all French rulers respected the national languages of their new citizens, while the Prussian tried to root them out. The result is hardly such as to encourage the advocates of governmental interference in national languages as a means of promoting national unity.

Russia is the third power which has attempted the state regulation of language. The conditions there are different from those in German Poland or Austria. In those the foreign language which it was attempted to introduce had the merit of culture on its side at least equal in literary value to that of the native tongue attacked. In Russia, on the contrary, the official tongue was comparatively a rude one. In literature, in science, in political institutions and general civilization the old kingdom of Poland stood as far superior to the subjects of the Czar as the Greeks of Constantinople stood to their Turkish conquerors. Still, after the reign of the first Alexander, the imperial government undertook to force its own official language as well as its laws upon its Polish subjects. The war against Polish language is still going on in Russian Poland as in Prussian Posen. It has succeeded in reducing the great province of Lithuania, once among the most cultured parts of the old Polish state, to a lower degree of educational development than even that of the semi-barbarous Russian districts. It has not succeeded in lessening the number of Polish speaking subjects of the Empire after nearly forty years of autocratic repression. What the actual result has been may be best gathered from a Russian source. The memoirs of Kornitoff, the oldest of Russian statesmen and a bitter enemy of Polish nationality during a life of ninety years, have lately been published. In them the statement is found that in the matter of superiority in culture the twenty millions of the Polish nationality outweigh the eighty millions of Russian. "Our poverty in culture compared with the wealth of the Polish element is apparent to every one," he declares. He goes on: "Our strength in the culture of civilization is not only small, but what is worse, it excites no feeling of emulation among the great majority of Russians who are alike indifferent to patriotic and to religious sentiments. Polish society, on the contrary, works incessantly and unanimously for its national and political ideals. The recovery of its independence is the inspiration of all scientific and literary activity among the Poles and their hate is constant, alike for the Russian government, its political

ideals and its orthodox religion. The Polish nation to-day can show a hundred writers of genius to every ten of Russian birth, and naturally it is steadily gaining ground in the contest of ideas between itself and the mighty Russian nation."

It looks as if the language campaign in Russia were even a more conspicuous failure than in Prussia. It has stimulated not destroyed the Polish language.

The experience of the three governments just described is, one would think, ample warning of the folly of attempting to force the laws of nature to political ends. The growth of human language is a natural process of the human intellect, and it can no more be regulated by legislation than the course of storms or the heat of summer. Men, in society, form their speech by their own needs and sentiments, and each national language is bound up with intimate feelings and traditions which defy the control of any political power. In each of the cases we have alluded to, the end sought by the law-makers was definite and clear. It was to give a political empire of many races the unity of other states where a single race predominated. The method adopted was the forced introduction of a common language through all the channels of power controlled by government. That these are inadequate to the end desired, and that their employment has produced a result directly contrary to the one sought by the rulers has been shown by experience clearly enough, as might have been foretold from the principles of human nature by any intelligent thinker.

It is instructive to compare the feeling of national loyalty in lands of different languages, where politics have not been allowed to interfere in their use, with the strength of the same feeling in the three empires which have tried the impossible task of state regulation of speech. In all the convulsions of modern Europe two states have been singularly free from internal disturbance. Belgium is one, Switzerland the other. In the first Flemish is the native tongue of half the population, Walloon or French of the other. During the whole course of Belgium's political existence the attachment of each race to the common country has been at least as strong as that of the French people to France or the English to England. In Switzerland the same conditions exist, though its cantons are divided between French, German and Italian in their official language. In old France the loyalty of the German and Italian speaking elements to the national unity has already been mentioned. Even in the British Empire the loyalty of French speaking Jersey and Welsh speaking Wales is something widely different from that of the Irish race, on whom a foreign speech has been despotically imposed. The lesson to statesmen is sufficiently plain.

So well indeed has the independence of language from political control been recognized by the common sense of mankind, that during the whole course of European foreign conquests no serious attempt has been made to impose the language of the conquerors on subject races. The natives of Algeria still speak their native Arabic or Kabyle, those of India their Hindostanee or Tamil, the Javanese their Malay tongue. Even where colonies of one European race have been transferred, politically, to the rule of another the original language has nearly always held its ground. Mauritius is still a French speaking land after a hundred years of English rule, and Quebec after a hundred and fifty. It is hardly necessary to recall that South Africa has not yet adopted the speech or national feelings of England, though a hundred years have passed since its separation from Holland.

In the face of all these facts lying before the eyes of the world, one asks, with wonder, what intelligence has prompted the American rulers of the Philippines to attempt the task of changing the language of seven millions of people? That they are seriously trying the same policy that the Czar of Russia and the German Kaiser have failed in is evident enough. "Common schools must be established everywhere and as a minimum standard every child must be taught the elements of arithmetic and to read and write in the English language" is the dictum of Judge Taft and his colleagues in their report to Mr. Root. "It is not practicable," they add, in all apparent seriousness, "to make the native languages the base of instruction, for this would necessitate the translation not merely of school primers, but of many texts of every sort into the principal dialects." Considering that the seven millions of Filipinos have been living in civilization for many generations, and that they already possess over two thousand schools for their own use, it is not evident why school primers need be translated for them from similar works adapted to the minds of children of other races. Neither is it evident why if needed such a task should be wholly beyond human power to execute. Father de Rada, the old Franciscan friar, accomplished it in the sixteenth century, and it has been repeated since by hundreds of Spanish teachers. To translate the elements of Christian doctrine into the dialects of savages, unacquainted with abstract ideas, is certainly a more difficult work than turning school primers and arithmetics from English or German into the languages of the now civilized Tagals and Visayas. The first has been successfully accomplished by Catholic missioners in nearly every part of the earth. Proof exists not only in the Philippines, but in nearly every Indian dialect of our own continent. Why, then, should such an undertaking seem impossible to five Commissioners who put forward their own intel-

lectual superiority as their justification for assuming control of an unwilling people? If they cannot translate school primers into Tagal, with the resources of the American Treasury to draw on, why not leave the instruction of the Tagals to the teachers who can?

The authorities with which the Commissioners, one, by the way, a college professor of history and another a college professor of zoology, support their remarkable decision are as surprising as the grounds on which they base it. The "commanding officers" of the American army are unanimous in urging English instruction and asking for trained English teachers, and "most of the commanding officers who have reported state that no instruction in native dialects is desirable." It is hardly the custom to regulate primary schooling by the wisdom of soldiers, nor is it generally thought that the officers of an army of invasion are competent judges of the intellectual wants of the people on whom they are waging war, but the rulers of the Philippines seem to assume both as facts which cannot be gainsaid. The climax of absurdity is the report of one of these military authorities, Captain Echols, which solemnly states: "To teach English to the natives a knowledge of Spanish or Tagalog is not necessary. I at one time had charge of 4,000 American Indians, with six American boarding schools (sic). Not a child could speak a word of English on entering the schools,' and, in three months from entry, these children could speak it fairly well, and this was accomplished by teachers utterly unfamiliar with any one of the numerous native dialects."

Captain Echols' report speaks for itself. Is a smattering of English words such as he boasts of having given to some Indian children "in six boarding schools" the kind of education which Messrs. Taft and Moses recommend for the elevation of the Filipinos? Is it more practicable to provide boarding schools, run by teachers utterly unfamiliar with the native dialects, than to translate school primers into Tagalog? The effect of the education given to the American Indians during the last thirty years, on the plan admired by Captain Echols, has not been such as to command the admiration of any but those engaged in the handling of Indian supplies. It certainly bears unsatisfactory comparison with the system which has filled Luzon and the Visaya Islands with millions of civilized men formed from races like the head hunters of Borneo.

It is evident from this selection of authorities on the subject that the Commissioners themselves have no practical knowledge of the methods by which languages are really taught in schools where such instruction is a reality. Such schools exist in many lands of Europe, especially near the borders of countries of different speech. In all, familiarity with both the languages used is necessary. It is

exactly the same in the Philippines as in Switzerland or Holland, and it has been exacted there, under the Spanish government, alike from teachers and priests. The method of Captain Echols was tried in the American missionary college in Connecticut as far back as the first Congregational mission to Hawaii. Three Hawaiian natives were taught English in the mission boarding school and taken out as interpreters by Messrs. Bingham and Thurston. Those gentlemen on experience reported their interpreters wholly useless. They had English words, but no grasp of ideas, and they were alike unable to convey those of their countrymen to the ministers, or the ministers' doctrines to their own people. Any competent teacher could predict the same result in the Philippines, were it practicable to try Captain Echols' method.

Another curious question arises from the supposed impossibility of finding American translators into the native languages. It is what opinion the Commissioners must really hold of the intellectual superiority of the teachers they are importing over the natives whom they propose to elevate to "higher standards." It has usually been held that educated men can learn new languages more readily than unschooled peasants. The reverse seems to be the case, in the mind of the Commissioners at least, in the Philippines. That the whole body of Tagal and Visaya children can become proficient in English in a few years if only a teacher is sent among every few thousands of them is assumed as perfectly natural. That the teachers themselves cannot be expected to master the native dialects, or even Spanish, before commencing their functions, seems equally natural to the intelligence of the Commissioners. The distinction is not flattering to the success of the American school system at home in developing intelligence. The peculiarity of requiring Malay children to accomplish a work in their primary schools which American college and normal school graduates find too much for their capacities is a strange specimen of the intelligence of the supreme government now ruling over the islands.

The same may be said of the motives which have led them to add the science of pedagogy to the already difficult functions of establishing a foreign government among a strange race on strictly American principles. That the only known principles of government that may be called distinctively American are that every people is the best judge of its own needs, and entitled to govern itself, may be let pass here. We are referring only to the reasons which prompted the Philippine Commissioners to add the new duty of regulation of the language and daily instruction of children to the sufficiently numerous duties of government, as it is ordinarily carried on in our own and other civilized countries. The administration of justice, the

collection of revenues, the establishment of a police, the regulation of municipal rights, of public works, of mining and forestry, of commerce, coinage, post office, military and naval matters would, to most minds, seem tasks sufficient to employ all the abilities of many more than five commissioners when seven millions of men have to be dealt with at the close of a devastating war. Some reason for adding experiments in school teaching and the introduction of a foreign language to these multifarious duties before any of them had been even reduced to working would naturally be looked for, but none is found in the report of the Commissioners.

They simply inform the public that there was a system of schools in these islands under Spanish rule, and that these differed from American common schools. The main difference described is that under the Spanish system a school was ungraded and strictly sectarian, while the American standard is a non-sectarian graded school. It is not explained how the schools already existing could be sectarian where no sects of different religions exist, so we may infer the Commissioners simply mean that religious instruction in the Catholic doctrines is regarded by the Filipinos as a normal part of schooling, while it is not thought so by the majority of public school teachers in America. It seems an inadequate reason for the new government to undertake both the schooling and the languages of the people put under its rule. Beyond this the only discovery reported in the educational condition of the islands is that of a "great diversity of opinion, due largely to the diverse conditions existing in the archipelago." The sagacity of this deduction recalls the Captain Bunsby of Dickens, but it seems hardly to warrant the conclusion arrived at in the report that the "peculiar conditions existing demand a centralized control of the public school system." The diverse conditions would seem to demand the very opposite to most minds. They certainly do when they are found on American soil.

What the result is likely to be for the moral and intellectual development of the Filipino population from the introduction as teachers of a thousand or more foreigners, ignorant alike of their language, their religion, their national character and social life, is not a pleasant thing to contemplate. Up to this time Catholic faith has been the basis on which all the moral ideas and moral life of the Filipinos has rested. That is acknowledged by the Commission. That their morality, in all points which are recognized by society and law through the civilized world, is at least equal to the average of our own land is not denied. The Commission's report describes Manila, even during the war, as "better than any American city of its size" in the matters of drunkenness and disorder, and adds that crimes of violence are comparatively few and "the general moral condition of

the city greatly maligned" by American correspondents. How is that moral condition likely to be affected when all teaching of religious motives for it is excluded from the schooling of the young, and their teachers are selected mainly on their knowledge of a foreign language and contempt of that spoken by their pupils. It is quite safe to assert, from the lessons of experience, that it will be one of two and no other. Either the Catholic Filipinos will reject the foreign teachers and their lessons alike, as the Catholic Poles to-day reject the German schoolmasters at the cost of imprisonment, or the young generation will grow up with a moral training like that of the Indians, who during the last thirty years have been trained in the "non-sectarian graded schools" which are the ideals of the Philippine Commission. The prospect is not encouraging if the reports of our own Indian Bureau may be given any credit. Crimes of violence, robbery and murder are at least ten-fold more numerous among the schooled Indians of America than among the Tagals or Visayas of the Philippines. Is that an object to be desired in the judgment of the Commission? If not we would like to know what is the exact nature of the elevation, moral and material, which they so confidently expect from their venture into the field of school teaching and the suppression of the languages in which ten generations have thought and spoken in the Philippines.

The dangers to the national union with which Austria is now threatened from the language war between Czech and German is a further warning to us here in America of the consequences that may arise from state interference with national tongues. Against the glib assertion of the "commanding officers" quoted by the Commission that instruction in the native dialects is not desirable, we may recall the grave words of Leo XIII. in his recent apostolic letter to the Bohemian Bishops on this very point.

One cause of the disunion now existing in Bohemia may be traced to the languages which its people speak according to their different descent. The desire to cherish and love the tongue of his parents is implanted by nature in every human being. We abstain from any decision in controversies of this kind. It is surely not censurable to cherish the mother tongue within due bounds. It is the duty of temporal rulers to safeguard individual rights where they do not interfere with the welfare of the state. It is ours to provide that religion be not brought into peril by such disputes, since faith is the highest possession of the soul, and the source of all other good. Though addressed to the episcopate of a foreign land, these words may well be pondered by us here in America.

From what source, in point of fact, have the members of the Taft Commission drawn the inspiration to imitate the policy of Czar and

Kaiser by rooting out the national languages of the Philippine people? It is certainly not from American practice since the foundation of our government. The American people has followed the example of the older civilized world in respecting, consistently, the right of its citizens to use the tongue of their fathers or any other, at their own judgment. The German-Americans of Pennsylvania have retained their ancestral tongue unchanged since their first settlement on this continent, and they have equal rights with any other class of Americans. In Louisiana the French-Americans have done the same on a larger scale, and their right to do so is recognized as well in the courts as in the schools. In California for many years the laws were printed equally in English and Spanish, and both languages were used on terms of equality in the Constitutional Convention and subsequent legislatures. Judge Taft and his fellows deny the same right to Filipinos. He limits the suffrage to those who can read and write Spanish or English unless they own a certain amount of real estate. The educational test, in the Philippines, excludes those who read and write their native tongues, unless they add the further one of either English or Spanish. As the large majority use their own languages for all purposes, they are only allowed to vote if possessed of property. Were a similar educational test applied in our country, and the command of at least one foreign language required as a qualification for the exercise of citizenship, the diminution in the lists of voters would make the suffrage a mockery. It is to be seriously feared it would exclude most of the gentlemen of the very Commission which is now proclaiming its desire to raise the Filipinos to the moral and intellectual standard of American citizens. If any one of them can even write Spanish it is not apparent from their report. It looks as if their decision that the use of the native languages for intruction is not desirable were based on the same reasons which made the Belgian college rector decline the services of George Primrose as a professor of Greek. "Young man," said the dignitary, "I do not know a word of Greek. I got my degree without Greek, I became rector of this college without Greek. I receive ten thousand florins a year without Greek. In fact, then, I don't see the use of Greek to me or any one else." On similar lines Messrs. Taft and Worcester may justify their antipathy to the Tagal and Visayan tongues. They do not know a word of them, yet without that knowledge they have been chosen by the President for their posts, they are now ruling in Manila, and they are drawing much larger salaries than they ever received in any previous employment. To them, indeed, the conclusion may be satisfactory that Tagal is of no use to them or to anybody else. It will hardly be so to the seven millions of human beings who are so

lightly told that the speech which has been handed down from their fathers and fathers' fathers, and which they have thought and spoke and prayed since infancy must be changed for the tongue of another race because their rulers of yesterday find it impracticable to provide school primers in that speech.

We do not think the American people will, on reflection, commit itself to the dangerous course of school despotism advised by the prentice statesmen of the Commission. That the root of bitterness it would plant may become a tree of no small dimensions the agitation now going on in Bohemia is a significant warning. Tagals and Visayas are men and have the feelings of men, even though they are "mere Malays," as the "common people" of our own land were incapable of understanding or virtue in the eyes of Judge Jay. The cult of the English language is not accepted by the great majority of American people, whatever may be the case with a body of college professors who find in it their justification for ignorance of any other.

BRYAN J. CLINCH.

San Francisco.

Scientific Chronicle.

EXPLORING THE ATMOSPHERE.

Most people in this country are familiar with the daily weather map published in the daily press and with the weather forecasts announced through the same medium. Few, however, realize the vastness of the work involved in preparing the material on which these predictions are based, or the benefit, estimated in money, which these predictions bring to the country. The annual expenditure by the government for the support of this bureau is over one million dollars. More than this amount is often saved by one timely prediction, as is shown in an instance cited by Mr. Willis L. Moore, Chief of the United States Weather Bureau, in the *Scientific American Supplement* for January 25 last. In the case referred to, the prediction of a cold wave saved over three million dollars' worth of property which would have been destroyed were it not for the precautions taken on account of the warning given by the Weather Bureau. In distributing these warnings it is not unusual for the Bureau to send out one hundred thousand telegrams in the space of one or two hours. If we add to this the millions saved the shipping industries of the country annually, we can readily see that the cost of the Bureau is a good government investment.

The success of the predictions depends largely upon the fact that over the great extent of our vast country we have 1,200 skilfully trained officials who report to Washington concerning weather conditions. Equidistantly distributed over the country there are 180 fully equipped meteorological stations. There is a central observatory in each State and Territory, to which the subordinate offices of the State or Territory report and to which about 3,000 voluntary observers throughout the country send their observations. With such a well regulated system of observations daily reported to one central office in Washington, we can form some idea of the confidence that may be placed in the predictions that are based on an accurate knowledge of the progress of any atmospheric condition as well as the modifications it is undergoing while in motion across the extent of the American Continent. A long series of such well regulated and coördinated observations made in the air strata near the surface of the earth has enabled the observers to give quite accurate predictions of what is to come as far as the causes operating at the lower levels of the atmosphere are concerned.

However, it has long been recognized that there are disturbing

causes that can be taken into account only by a better knowledge of the conditions that prevail in the upper strata of the atmosphere. Hence the adoption of means whereby these conditions may be studied. Glaisher in England in the middle of the last century understood the importance of this study when he made his wonderful balloon ascensions, in one of which, made of the 5th of September, 1861, he reached the phenomenal height of about seven miles. In this ascent, however, it must be noted that after he had reached the height of about 29,000 feet the cold was so intense that he fainted and could take no more observations, and the height attained is only an approximate estimation made from the lowest barometric height supposed to have been reached.

After the days of Glaisher interest in such observations seems to have waned in England, but was born with new vigor in the United States, France, Austria and Russia. Knowledge of the atmospheric conditions in the higher strata was at first sought by means of observations taken at observatories placed on the summits of high mountains. But it was soon realized that even at such elevations the conditions were influenced by the air from the plains below and that it was necessary to reach higher and freer air strata if the study was to be of any value in advancing the science of meteorology.

It was at this stage of the question that the idea of Mr. Willis Moore was put into execution in the United States. Seventeen places were selected in different parts of the States and daily observations were made of the temperatures, pressures and air currents at a height of one mile above the surface. These observations were made by means of self-registering instruments carried to that height by kites. The form of kite adopted was the Hargrave, which resembles a box with the top and bottom removed. The kite has from 80 to 90 square feet of lifting surface, and the weight of the instruments carried is a little over two pounds. It is held by a steel piano wire played out from a reel. The length of the wire and its angle of inclination give the height of the kite.

The kite proved itself a most useful instrument in the hands of meteorologists and gradually perfected it explored higher and higher strata of the atmosphere, reaching a height of 12,000 feet. But while the kite experiments were making in this country, in France they were experimenting with unmanned balloons. From the first these experiments met with success. The first unmanned balloon sent up from Paris by Hermite reached a height of 45,000 feet and the self-registering instruments it carried worked perfectly to an altitude of 36,000 feet. Later one launched at Berlin by Assmann rose to a height of 46,500 feet, registering at that height a barometric pressure of only 3.3 inches. Very few of these unmanned balloons were lost,

for they were labelled with a notice directing the finder to inform the nearest observatory of the finding of the balloon. In this way eight out of every ten were returned.

At the international æronautic conferences of 1896 and 1898 the importance of concerted action was discussed and Austrian, Bavarian, Belgian, French, German and Russian æronauts agreed to make simultaneous explorations of the atmosphere at the beginning of each month. Hence on certain days manned and unmanned balloons and captive kites start for the higher levels of the atmosphere from Berlin, Brussels, Munich, Paris, St. Petersburg, Strasburg and Vienna. In these explorations Germany holds a unique position on account of the results obtained by means of her manned balloons. Dr. Berson reached the height of 30,030 feet. In his balloon ascensions he overcomes the difficulty of breathing in the highly rarefied air of these great altitudes by carrying along a supply of oxygen. In company with Süring on the 1st of August last he reached the phenomenal height of 33,700 feet, where he found a temperature of —40 degrees Fahrenheit.

The conclusions reached from the observations thus made are at present chiefly two, one regarding the temperature of the air and the other the motion of the air. It was always known that the temperature diminished as the elevation increased. Relying on the observations of Glaisher meteorologists never thought that the higher strata were as cold as they are. There seems to be a law of decrease of about three degrees Fahrenreit for every elevation of a thousand feet. The temperature of freezing is found between 6,600 and 10,000 feet above the surface of the earth. The more accurate observations of the present day are obtained by the use of more perfect instruments and the more careful protection of these instruments from disturbing causes. The decrease of three degrees for every elevation of one thousand feet does not hold good at great heights, but the ratio of decrease grows higher, reaching nearly twice as much in the highest levels. In connection with this variation of temperature it is interesting to note the fact that the variations which constitute the difference between summer and winter are felt also at these higher levels although of course not in the same degree.

The result of these atmospheric explorations is to throw light on the cause of the long known cold spell which is observed in the middle of May. It seems clear now that this cold wave is not due to local disturbances nor yet, as it was thought to the earth entering a colder part of planitary space, but to a mass of air about 30,000 feet thick and covering all Europe which is set into rotatory motion, so that cold air from the north polar regions is brought down upon

Western Europe, while warm air is poured upon Eastern Europe from the southwest. The cause of this regularly recurring rotation of the air is yet unknown. In general there is in the upper strata a far more simple distribution of temperatures, pressures and air currents, and the full effect upon the prediction of surface changes in the air will depend upon further explorations.

RADIUM.

In 1898 M. Curie, Madame Curie and M. Bemont discovered in an ore of uranium a new substance to which the name of radium was given. The extraction of this substance from the ore is a long and costly process. From a ton of the ore only about .10 of a gramme of radium chloride is obtained. Radium has been classed as an element and its atomic weight determined as 175. Still whether it is an element or only an allotropic modification of an element is not clear. Recent investigation seems to confirm the latter opinion.

The chief interest in the new substance centres in its extraordinary properties. Its property of emitting rays similar in some respects to X-rays attracts most attention. In 1896 Becquerel in a study of phosphorescent bodies found that the salts of uranium emit radiations that have a great similarity to the X-rays. These have been called Becquerel rays. Radium emits these rays in quantity about 100,000 times greater than uranium.

The character of these rays and their cause is at present an open question. The difficulty of solving the puzzle increases with every new investigation. At first these rays seemed to be merely Rontgen rays. Soon, however, they developed extraordinary peculiarities. Like cathodic rays they are in part deviated by the magnetic field. Another part is not deviated like the X-rays. The deviable rays are charged negatively. These rays are not reflected or refracted or polarized, and this is contrary to our present conception of all vibratory motion. How, then, are we to explain these rays? Are they a form of radiant energy or of radiant matter?

According to the first theory the radium is the centre whence emanate waves whereby energy is transmitted to the objects that receive and absorb these rays or waves. According to the second or corpuscular theory now in vogue the radium is a centre whence emanate exceedingly small particles of matter which impinge on objects in their path and thus transmit the energy of the source.

Radium seems to emit particles of matter and the radium dust, as it is called, renders all the objects that it reaches radio-active. As a consequence no precise electrical measurements can be made in its presence, for all the insulators become good conductors. Radium,

moreover, has the property of being spontaneously luminous. This is readily observed in semi-darkness and the intensity of the light is great enough to distinguish written characters. Moisture diminishes the luminosity which is restored on drying. Time does not seem to diminish the brightness of the light, for at the end of a year there is no perceptible difference in the intensity of the light.

The radium rays produce very interesting chemical effects. They convert oxygen into ozone and in general act as powerful oxidizing agents. They, moreover, exercise an energetic action on photographic plates, even through opaque bodies, producing radiographs like those of the X-rays. The physiological effects are not less interesting. The radiations produce more serious burns than the X-rays do. A small amount of radium inclosed in a tube and carried in the vest pocket caused a severe burn in the side which with careful treatment did not heal for several weeks.

In connection with the theoretical question involved in the study of the new phenomena of radio-activity, the experiments of Sir William Crookes, described in a paper read before the Royal Society on February 6 are of great interest. As the lecturer stated, "these experiments indicate that the electrons from the radio-active agent partake of the properties of a fog or mist of material particles capable of diffusing away in the free air like odoriferous particles when not kept in by a thick metal screen." This conclusion was arrived at from a series of experiments indicating the action of these radiations on photographic plates. A sensitive plate exposed over two pieces of radio-active material, the one surrounded by free air, the other separated from the plate by a column of air inclosed in a thick lead tube, showed a strong action in the latter case and no action in the former after the lapse of forty-eight hours.

A large number of similar experiments with different radio-active substances and with variations in the time of exposure gave results justifying the above conclusion. A further series of experiments showed that a current of air passing over a radio-active substance and allowed to impinge upon a photographic plate effects it and therefore that such an air current carries with it a certain proportion of the corpuscles radiated from the substance.

A highly active self-luminous radium compound loses some of its energy on exposure to ordinary air, but when sealed in vacuo in a quartz tube no diminution of energy has been detected in the space of twelve months. According to the measurements of M. and Mme. Curie the radiating energy is the ten-millionth part of a watt. It is certain that the study of these new phenomena will lead to a readjustment of our notions of the transmission of energy by means of radiation.

WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY.

Since our last Chronicle, wherein we referred to the experiments of Guglielmo Marconi at St. Johns, Newfoundland, he has announced to the world something of the success he met with in those experiments. In *McClure's Magazine* for February, 1902, Mr. Ray Stannard Baker prints an account of Marconi's achievements as given by himself in a personal interview at St. John's and in conversation on a journey to Nova Scotia which Mr. Baker made in company with Mr. Marconi.

The results may be thus briefly stated: On December 10, 1901, Marconi sent up one of his kites as a preliminary test of the wind velocity. The wire snapped and the kite blew out to sea. He then sent up a 14-foot hydrogen balloon which met with the same fate. On the 12th he succeeded in holding a kite at an elevation of about 400 feet. By previous agreement the operators at Poldu, Cornwall, England, were on the receipt of the news that everything was ready to begin sending the prearranged signal at 3 P. M. and continue to do so at regular intervals until 6 P. M., English time. This corresponded to the time between 11.30 and 2.30 P. M. at St. Johns.

At noon on December 12, at his table with all the delicate receiving instruments within easy reach and connected to the ærial wire, Marconi sat, a telephone receiver to his ear, waiting for the signal. For half an hour nothing was heard. Then the tapper hit the coherer, an indication that something was coming. Shortly after Marconi handed the receiver to his companion, Mr. Kemp, asking him to try if he could hear anything. Mr. Kemp took the receiver and heard faintly yet distinctly the three little clicks, the letter S, sent out from England by previous arrangement. At 10 minutes past 1 more signals came, and both observers assured themselves again that there could be no mistake.

At 20 minutes after 2 other repetitions of the signals were received. The fact that the kite did not maintain a constant height above the earth prevented the continuous reception of the signals sent out from England.

The previous successes of the inventor, coupled with the fact that he has never been obliged to retract any statement that he has given to the world, was sufficient to bring universal acceptance of the truth of the achievement the moment Marconi announced it.

Any doubt that might have arisen about the message having come from some passing steamer carrying Marconi instruments, was quickly removed by the fact that the "call" of a steamer is not the letter "S," but the letter "V." Moreover, the receiver used by Marconi was tuned to the transmitting instrument in England, and

would not respond to any other known transmitter. This method of tuning for selective signalling Marconi has perfected to a certain degree, but much yet remains to be done as far as the public has been informed.

After obtaining these results Mr. Marconi returned to England. If there was any doubt about the Newfoundland results it was dispelled by the results obtained on his return trip to New York. He reached New York on Saturday, March 1, and gave to the public through the daily press the facts concerning the communication kept up between the Cornwall station, England, and the Philadelphia, the vessel on which he sailed. Complete messages were received regularly until the vessel had reached a point 1,551.5 miles from the station at Cornwall, England. This was the last point at which a complete message was received, but signals continued to be received until the vessel had put 2,099 miles between herself and the sending station. This is about the distance the signals were received in the experiments made last December at Newfoundland; thus showing that the power of the Cornwall station is just about great enough to send signals that distance.

Mr. Marconi brought with him on this trip two experienced assistants who will have charge of the arrangements for the Newfoundland station. The power of the English station will also be increased considerably. When these improvements have been made we can confidently expect to see the commercial application of wireless telegraphy.

It is announced that a contract has been made with the Canadian government for the transmission of transatlantic messages at the rate of ten cents a word and press despatches at a rate of five cents. In return the government will contribute $80,000 towards the erection of the station in Nova Scotia. If this be true there will be a saving of 60 per cent. on the present rate of 25 cents for ordinary transatlantic messages.

FORMATION OF HAIL.

An interesting article has lately appeared in *Knowledge* giving an explanation of the formation of hailstones. The explanation advanced draws on no occult forces, but shows that the forces we know exist are sufficient to account for the observed phenomena. First of all it is necessary to have moisture, and we know that it exists in the atmosphere in abundance. The clouds are nothing but great patches of moisture floating in the air. But for the formation of clouds even the moisture of the air must be condensed. For this

condensation a fall in temperature is necessary which is secured in the ever increasing cold of the higher elevations to which the moisture is rising. Then the condensed moisture must be floated for a time in the air. In the centre of the hailstone is found an atom of dust forming the foundation of the icy structure. The moisture of the air is thus suspended by this floating dust particle. The height to which the dust particle has been raised represents the expenditure of an amount of energy, for the force of gravity had to be overcome, and this can be done only by the expenditure of energy which alone does work. This is storing up in the dust particle with its load of moisture a large amount of potential energy which will be utilized in its future development.

The dust particle with its moisture must be raised to greater heights that the second stage of the process, the freezing of the water may be enacted. This is the infant hailstone which under favorable conditions will develope. It must be carried up to colder heights by one of those strong ascending currents that rise from all parts of the earth. The existence of these currents is indicated by the cumulus clouds which are but the tops of such columns of air made visible by the condensation of the vapor that they carry. The tiny atom of dust with its load of moisture entering such an ascending column is carried to a height where its position is decidedly advantageous and where the water on it congeals. Even here it may find a new force to raise it still higher. Whenever condensation takes place there is always an accompanying liberation of latent heat. The effect of this heat is, of course, to raise the temperature of the layers of air in which it is set free and consequently to start a new upward movement of the air. Here the miniature hailstone would be in a region surrounded by ice crystals on which it could feed for its growth. Starting with this frozen rain-drop we find that it is resolutely pulled to earth by the force of gravity and must before long yield to this dominating force and begin its downward journey.

As it begins to descend slowly it draws to itself other particles of frozen moisture just as surely as it itself is drawn to the earth. This conglomerate mass is continually shifting its centre of gravity as it grows irregularly. In its downward journey it will pass through strata of the air that vary very much in temperature and moisture. Some layers will be above the freezing point and others below. In its fall it may plunge through a cloud a thousand feet in thickness. The moisture clinging to it is quickly frozen. This variation of conditions to which the hailstone is subjected produces a marked peculiarity in its structure. Each hailstone is made up of a series of icy girdles alternately clear and opaque. These tell the story of the strata through which it passed. When the temperature of the strata

was below that of the hailstone the moisture that deposited on it was frozen into a clear girdle of ice. When the temperature was above that of the stone then the girdle of ice was opaque.

Another favorable condition for the growth of a hailstone is the lengthening of the time of fall. The presence of conditions producing this effect can be easily detected at least in the case of hailstorms remarkable for the large size of the hailstones. Hail usually accompanies a thunderstorm or a tornado. In both there is an atmospheric whirl. A hailstone in the process of growing caught up in this whirl instead of falling direct to earth in a vertical line, would be carried round and round in the air, an operation that may be repeated several times. In this motion it will be carried again and again through strata of varying degrees of moisture and temperature, and its growth will go on just as if it was falling vertically, only that it will continue longer and produce a larger hailstone. Finally a variation in the rate of motion or in the size of the stone will result in the stone being cast off from the sides of the cloud. As a result the hail falls on the earth in a long narrow belt, the width of which is determined by the dimensions of the cloud.

WIRELESS TELEPHONY.

The success of the method of transmitting telegraphic signals without the use of the familiar land wires and submarine cables had the effect of stimulating research for a way of transmitting speech without the use of the connecting wires of our present telephone system. Although several attempts have been made to develope a successful system of wireless telephony, still the experimental stage has not been passed. Results have been obtained, however, which are very encouraging and which seem to point to a solution of the problem that will be of commercial value.

In this connection the wireless telephone system of Professor A. Frederick Collins, an electrical engineer of Philadelphia, must be referred to. The Collins system makes use of the earth as the connection between the sending and the receiving station. At each station there is the ordinary equipment of a simple telephone station, the telephone receiver and transmitter, connected up in the ordinary way. Instead of the ærial wire connections now in use, at each station a single wire runs down into the ground, where it is joined to a zinc wire screen buried a few feet beneath the surface of the earth. With such an arrangement sounds of all kinds may be sent through the transmitter and received with a distinctness surpassing that of the ordinary method of telephone communication.

By means of this invention messages have been transmitted without wires across the Delaware river, at Philadelphia, a distance of over a mile, and it is reported that the words received have in all cases been as sharp and as clear as if uttered by a person only a few feet away. The inventor, according to report, has solved the problem of selective telephony, whereby instruments may be so tuned that only the receiver intended will catch the message sent out by a given transmitter. In the arrangement referred to both a receiver and transmitter must be employed, for one of the instruments will not fulfil both functions.

M. E. Ducretet, a well-known French electrician, has been experimenting along the same lines and with very marked success. He also uses the earth as the sole conductor. In his experiments the transmitter consists of a microphone and a few cells of battery connected directly to two metal plates of considerable surface buried about six feet below the surface of the ground. This is the sending station. At the receiving station he makes use of a well about 60 feet deep. Down into this well a metal ball about three inches in diameter is lowered by means of an insulated wire. At the top of the well the wire emerges through a cast iron pipe twelve feet long and four inches in diameter. This wire is attached to one end of an ordinary telephone receiver, the other end of which is connected to the iron pipe at the surface of the ground. The metal ball at the bottom of the well rests upon the ground. Thus two earth circuits are made and in the experiments described they were a considerable distance apart, being separated by building with cellars and thick walls.

When the microphone is spoken into all the vibrations, even the feeblest, give rise to variations in the current which is closed through the earth. Notwithstanding the multiple variations of this current and the nature of the conductor, the words are reproduced at the receiving station with remarkable distinctness. If the ball at the receiving station, which rests at the bottom of the well, be raised off the ground all reception of messages ceases at that station. In the neighboring building dynamos, both direct and alternating, were working during the experiments, but they did not interfere in any way with the transmission of the messages.

With the arrangement above described the operator was able to send currents strong enough to work a telegraphic relay and also an electric bell. M. Ducretet is at present continuing his experiments over greater distances and under varying conditions.

D. T. O'Sullivan, S. J.

Boston, Mass.

Book Notices.

JESUS LIVING IN THE PRIEST. Considerations on the Greatness and Holiness of the Priesthood. By the *Rev. P. Millet, S. J.* English Translation by the Right Rev. Thomas Sebastian Byrne, D. D., Bishop of Nashville. 8vo., pp. 517. New York: Benziger Brothers.

This work was originally written in French and first published in 1858. It was afterwards translated into Italian and ran through four editions, the last one appearing in 1898. The author's name did not appear on the first edition, but the merits of the work were sufficient to procure for it a warm reception. Then the author carefully revised it, made many additions to it and brought it out over his own name. He explains his purpose briefly thus:

"The only end which I propose myself in this work is to increase the knowledge and love of Jesus Christ in priests and through them, in all Christian peoples. The title which I give it necessarily forbids mention in its pages of certain vices which at times dishonor the sanctuary, and I have therefore excluded all such matter. A long experience, gained in giving retreats to ecclesiastics, has taught me, first, that it is very beneficial to remind a priest of his sublime vocation and to strongly impress upon his mind whatever will best serve to withdraw him from all that is base and mean; and, next, that he should be encouraged rather than frightened. While his mission is to do good, many struggles and gainsayings come to him from every side, and, of all temptations, discouragement is the most frequent and the most depressing. My purpose is to place this book at his side as a friend to buoy him up, to strengthen and console him; as a friend who will ceaselessly speak to him, saying: Courage, courage, O man of God! You are going along the same road already traversed by your Divine Master. He looks down upon you from high heaven, and is preparing to crown, not what you successfully accomplish, but what you honestly endeavor to do."

The history of the present translation is interesting. "The translator, while in Rome in 1899, picked up a copy of the work in a book store. He was attracted by the title, and still more by the table of contents. No book he had read on the subject seemed quite satisfactory. He began to read this, and was fairly carried away by its order, its precision, its luminous teaching, its deep spirituality and its common sense. When he had read it through he put it aside for some months and then took it up again. It was even more instructive, edifying and delightful than when first read, thus fulfilling in a measure the conditions of a classic."

The declaration of the author's purpose and the translator's experience caused us to approach the book with keenly awakened interest, and we were not disappointed. Every priest must have felt over and over again the discouragement that follows a realization of the sublimity of the priesthood and man's unworthiness. At such times he must have yearned for the reassuring voice of a true friend who would bid him take courage and remember that he was walking in the footsteps of the suffering Jesus, who would crown not only his successful accomplishments, but his honest endeavors. And now to be assured that he can find this friend in Father Millet's book, is sufficient to induce him to take it up with the eagerness with which he would run forward to meet a dear friend.

The plan of the work may be set forth in six considerations. The first deals with the general idea of the priest; the second with his hidden life, a preparation for the office of the priesthood; the third with his public life, exercises of the sacred ministry; the fourth with his suffering life, the trials of the sacred ministry and conditions of success; the fifth with his Eucharistic life, the Eucharist being the great means of achieving success in the labors of the ministry; and the sixth with his glorious life, the rewards of the labors of the holy ministry.

It can be seen at a glance that the whole life of a priest is summed up under these headings, clearly and completely. In the development of these general divisions the author is still more luminous, as the sunlight first shows us the general outlines of a room and its contents, and then more perfectly describes colors and shapes. He developes his subject so gradually, so clearly, so convincingly that he draws the reader after him irresistably, and illuminates his mind and moves his will. It is this combined power that is most remarkable. It is not so rare to meet with authors who provoke thought, but the author who compels action is the master.

At the beginning of each section there is a prologue or synopsis of the matter which follows; at the close there is an epilogue, or summing up of what has gone before; between these the subject is developed and illustrated.

Here is an example of how forcibly the truth is stated:

"Zeal is revealed in its effects. There is no fire without heat. Now, tell me, is the fire within us felt by those about us? Is the purpose and scope of our labors and whatever we do to carefully cultivate the field entrusted to us; to instruct the ignorant, to bring back the erring and to strengthen and support the righteous?

"You tell me that in your parish faith is gradually becoming extinct, that the sacraments are not frequented, that the laws of the Church are spurned and despised; that vice has usurped the place of

virtue, and that everything is languishing, decaying and going to the bad. But if the wolf is ravaging the flock, whose fault is it? Is it not the fault of the pastor who instead of watching is droning and slumbering?" Then follows a warning against mistaking the effect of a restless temperament and an impetuous character for zeal. Here is the test of true zeal: "Does your charity take on every form? Does it go out to all your erring brethren? Do you labor in season and out of season for their salvation? Do you promptly welcome them, no matter whence they come, even though they differ from you in all things not essentially of faith?" Is not this thought provoking?

The chapter on preaching is particularly strong. "The curse of the age is that the Saviour of the world is not known. There is no notion of life higher than that of the senses and superior to reason; the principle of grace is simply ignored. The educated are rationalists and the ignorant do not think at all, while both are in their lives practically Pelagians with the exception of a few who realize the necessity of supernatural aid for the practice of virtue, and earnestly and continually seek it in prayer. This is the reason why souls have neither strength nor energy; why they faint and lie helpless by the wayside.

"The sum of Christianity is this: Human nature fallen in Adam and rehabilitated in Jesus Christ.

"Rationalism, which is an epitome of all errors, is nothing more nor less than a protest against the dogma of the fall of man and his rehabilitation by Jesus Christ. If in our instructions we succeed in firmly establishing these two palmary truths, in bringing them home to the people, and in making them dominant throughout the world, we shall have utterly overthrown, to the very foundation, the master heresy of modern times, and furnished the only efficient remedy against anarchy in the intellect and corruption in the will.

"The first form of instruction, and the most important, is the catechism, provided the catechism is a good one and the catechist knows how to use it. Catechism is the milk of childhood. The explanation of the Gospels and sermons are the bread which is broken to the strong."

How nicely the defects of preaching are summed up under three heads. "The first defect is to say good things, but to say them wretchedly: *bona sed non bene*. The second defect is that of those who talk well, in fact too well, but who say nothing worth listening to: *bene sed non bona*. While avoiding the second defect be on your guard against falling into a third, the worst of all, namely, the defect of saying worthless things, and saying them wretchedly: *nec bona nec bene*

"This is frequently what happens in the case of those speakers who boast of being able to preach on the spur of the moment, and who go up into the pulpit without any preparation whatever, either proximate or remote. These men overwhelm their audiences with a deluge of words which have neither sense nor application to the matter in hand; they throw out statements at random and utter propositions that are inexact if not erroneous; they weary their hearers by their endless prolixity. Once they get into the pulpit they seem determined to stay there; they cast themselves upon the bosom of the stream of their own eloquence, and are borne along by its current; in their journey onward they describe the woods and the meadows, the cities and the mountains, without knowing when or where to cast anchor or to come ashore. They so overload and confuse the memory of their hearers that these are incapable of retaining anything of what has been said. It is like putting out a lighted lamp by flooding it with oil."

We could go on quoting indefinitely from every page in the book, but sufficient has been produced to give a hint of its excellence. It should be in the hands of every priest in the country. Its value cannot be overestimated. No one can read it without being benefitted by it, and it can be read with profit continuously. It is a great book.

FENELON: HIS FRIENDS AND HIS ENEMIES, 1651-1715. By *E. K. Sanders.* 8vo., pp. 426, with portrait. London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

The book is divided into two parts; the first treats of "Fenelon and the Controversies of the Church;" the second treats of "Fenelon in Exile." There are seven chapters in the first part entitled: "The Early Years of Fenelon," "Louis, Duke of Burgundy," "Madame de Maintenon," "Madame Guyon," "The Quietism Controversy," "Bossuet and Telemaque," "Fenelon and the Jansenists." There are six chapters in the second part, headed: "The Familiar Friends of Fenelon," "Fenelon the Politician," "From Cambrai to Versailles," "Fenelon the Archbishop," "The Spiritual Letters" and "The Last Years of Exile." There is also an appendix containing a few notes and a very short index.

It is always best to let an author speak for himself, for it is always fairest. He says on the first page:

"In this endeavor to portray the figure of Francois de Fenelon, Archbishop of Cambrai, it has been my desire to discover and set forth the truth, and not to shroud or overwhelm him with the glories of a perfection to which he did not attain. There is no dimness or uncertainty to obscure his reputation. His name occurs in less or

greater prominence in most of the innumerable memoirs and correspondence of the period; but he attained to that unenviable pitch of eminence which makes a character a party question, and the testimonies regarding it are therefore curiously conflicting. It is certain that he was ambitious, but he lacked the cool and wary temper that secures fulfilment of ambition. He was headstrong, and his self-confidence lured him to inconsistency. He could be jealous also, and, even when the passage of the years had purified and tempered many weaknesses, a little spark of malice, lying far below the surface, broke into flame. But though these stains, and others such as these, lie marked and defined upon the pages of his record, it does not cease to be a fair one, and every stage in the advance to closer knowledge of him establishes the conviction of his abiding purity of faith and conduct with greater clearness."

This is a fair beginning, and it makes us wish that the author had clung more faithfully to his text. If his theme throughout the book had been Fenelon, and other had been introduced only so far as they threw light or shadow on him, we should have had a much more pleasing and profitable book. But, unfortunately, Mr. Sanders decided to write a history instead of a biography, and that is, we imagine, the more difficult task. The title of the book indicates the spirit in which it is written. If an author starts out with the thought in his mind that those who agree with his hero are the hero's friends, while those who disagree with him are his enemies, he will almost certainly produce a distorted picture. He espouses the cause of the person about whom he writes, and he is no longer able to understand that there may be an honest difference of opinion about the topic under discussion. He also loses sight of the truth that good men sometimes do imprudent things, or hurt others through mistaken or misguided zeal. It is hardly fair to call such persons enemies of their neighbors. The word has an ugly sound, and should be used seldom. It is certainly a very serious matter to fasten it to a man of umblemished reputation who does not agree with another on questions of policy, or expediency, or the application of principles to particular cases. Such a treatment of a subject is due in most cases to prejudice, or ignorance, or inability to understand, because of lack of sympathy.

The first and most important thing in a work of this kind is to get the right view point. Artists tell us that in order to judge a picture rightly we must get the artist's point of view. We must know the objects which he wished to reproduce, their relations to one another, their color, shape, size, not only absolutely, but under the light in which they are painted. Only then can we pass judgment on the picture.

This is true also of real life. To judge men and their actions we must see them as they lived; study their relations to one another; consider the light which shone on them, the difficulties which lay in their path and take into consideration all the circumstances that surrounded them. If we do not act in this way we shall surely get distorted views of men and things.

Probably there are few writers who intend to be unfair, and yet there are many unfair writers. The wrong view point is very often responsible. We fear that Mr. Sanders got the wrong view point, and hence a tone of bitterness runs through the book, and especially in reference to churchmen. For instance, on page 7 he tells us that Fenelon's time was "a period of perpetual intrigue and treachery, in which there were no adepts equal to the priests." Now that is one of those general statements so easily made and just as easily denied. Here is an example of the mean general insinuation even more unpardonable than the general assertion. "But the Jesuit confessors had methods of their own for justifying conduct. The Abbé Gobelin retained the direction of Mme. Scarron's conscience in spite of her questionable office; and later Bossuet joined him in the task of persuading her that she was the chosen instrument for the conversion of the King." Mr. Sanders ought to know that Jesuit theology is Catholic theology, and that to accuse them of being guided by a particular code of morals different from that which is used by other priests is very childish, to put it mildly.

There are many other things to which we object, but to which we cannot refer in particular. If one is sufficiently well read to take them at their true worth, he will find Mr. Sanders' book very interesting and very instructive. Others had better leave it alone.

A MANUAL OF ASCETICAL THEOLOGY; or, the Supernatural Life of the Soul on Earth and in Heaven. By *Rev. Arthur Devine*, Passionist. Author of "Convent Life," "The Creed Explained," etc. 8vo., pp. xxii., 616. London: R. & T. Washbourne. New York: Benziger Brothers.

"Ascetical Theology may be defined: A science which from truths divinely revealed explains the doctrine by which souls are directed in the acquisition and perfection of the supernatural life, according to the ordinary providence of God. It is a branch of moral theology, and must of necessity have the ordinary science of theology as its foundation. Although with mystical theology it forms a sub-division of moral theology, it is distinct from both of these sciences. While moral theology prescribes the rules of action, ascetical theology teaches the means by which sanctity of life may be acquired, increased and perfected.

"On the other hand, mystical theology seems to indicate a higher and sublimer degree of asceticism. This science does not teach the ordinary and well beaten paths of perfection, but shows a *more excellent way*, and deals with a more hidden intercourse between man and God, always aspiring as it does to the higher and the better things, according to the words: *Whither the impulse of the spirit was to go, thither they went, and they turned not when they went.*"

Scaramelli thus explains Christian asceticism. After the soul, assisted by Divine Grace, has overcome the sensitive part of our being, and withdrawn it from unlawful indulgence in the use and fruition of creatures, and after it has been established in justice according to the rules of moral theology, then, strengthened and attracted by God, it begins to ascend higher in the scale of perfection, and causes the inferior part of our nature to ascend with it, and thus to become more spiritual. The spiritual or supernatural life is the true life of man.

Before a man reaches the perfection of the spiritual or supernatural life it behooves him to labor much, to fight hard, because the sensitive part is entirely inclined to creatures, and it does not freely and easily follow the spirit ascending to God, but does so only by force and pressure.

The ascetical man—the man desirous of Christian perfection—not only does not wish to transgress the limits placed by God on earthly enjoyment, but wishes not to exercise his whole liberty with regard to such enjoyment. The moral man maintains a *necessary* course between God and the creature; the ascetical man elects a *free* course, not according to the liberty of the senses, which does not wish to be restrained by any law, but according to the liberty of the spirit, which does not wish to be impeded by any cupidity. The supernatural or spiritual man, when he goes beyond the way of the Commandments and enters upon the way of the counsels, has no longer the beaten and well-known path indicated by the Tables of the Law, written with the finger of God, to tell him distinctly what to do and what to avoid.

There are two ways of the counsels by which man, whether in the active, or in the contemplative, or in the mixed state, may arrive at Christian perfection. The first consists in the *perfect* observance of the Commandments. The other way of the counsels exceeds the way of the Commandments as to its object in so far as it involves new duties and adds them to the Commandments.

In the first way—namely, that of the Commandments—all who desire perfection can and ought to walk, because it is a false devotion to observe counsels and to neglect the Commandments.

In respect to human beings and God's dealing with them, there are

three forms of the supernatural which are manifested: miracles, revelations and the operation of grace. The present work deals with the last. It treats of the supernatural life of our souls as effected by grace and the virtues here, and perfected by the Beatific Vision on obtaining our last end in the possession of God in heaven.

For the sake of order and of greater clearness the work is divided into three parts, and these parts are again sub-divided into chapters. Part I. treats of the supernatural life of the soul on earth, considered in its nature and as to its gifts, and contains nineteen chapters. Part II. explains in fourteen chapters the growth and increase of the supernatural life and the means of that increase. Part III. is occupied with the consideration and exposition of the final perfection of the supernatural life in heaven, and consists of nine chapters.

The importance and excellence of the work may be gathered from this outline of its scope and plan. It has an added value at the present time, when on the one hand there is such a frightful tendency in popular educational institutions to infidelity, and on the other an inclination on the part of earnest non-Catholics to enter the true Church.

History of England. By *L. York Powell, M. A.*, Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford, and *T. F. Tout, M. A.*, Professor of History at the Owens College, Victoria University. 8vo., pp. XLIII.—1115. New York: Longmans, Green & Co. New Edition in One Volume, revised throughout, and with additional matter and Index. With 38 Maps and Plans.

This is a new edition of a work which formerly appeared in three parts. It was already known and highly commended. In its revised form it is certainly up to date, for it contains an account of the English-Boer war in South Africa, and closes with the fall of Pretoria and the flight of President Kruger.

This history was planned and has been written with an especial view to its use in schools and among younger students who read on the subject. It contains, first, a connected relation of the main facts of the political and constitutional history in due chronological order; secondly, a sketch, as thorough as space would allow, of the course and progress of the language, literature and social life of the English people, in a series of chapters at the ends of the various periods into which the history naturally falls. The authors tell us that they have tried to make the book a history not merely of England or England and Wales, in the narrower sense, but of the whole British Empire, and have given as much space as they could command to the history of Scotland and Ireland, the old and new Colonial Empires and the British domination in India. For the full understanding of many of the institutions and events noticed the beginner will require oral help from the teacher.

In many instances the most dramatic and pathetic incidents of the story are given in the very words of a contemporary authority, but at all times the authors have tried to write in a simple, straightforward style. To make the work easier for the student a brief glossary has been added of the few unusual or technical words which it was impossible to avoid.

Maps, plans, tables and pedigrees have been supplied in sufficient detail to enable the reader to get a true idea of the relative positions of the persons or places named in the text. The authors assure us that they have written the book mainly from original documents, without neglecting to consult modern authors. The index is very full, and the headings affixed to each section give a running epitome of the whole book. When all this is said, the reader must remember that a history of England told in any one volume, no matter how large it may be, cannot be more than a very brief outline. And yet we have never seen more put into a volume of this size than we find in the one before us. Nor is there any evidence of crowding, for a singular beauty of style is preserved throughout. As some one has well said, "many chapters in the earlier part of the work read with the grace and force of the greater chroniclers."

But now we come to a more important question: What is the value of the book as a history? We must distinguish: the authors seem to wish to be fair, but they sometimes fail. The history of a country like England which is filled with so much religious controversy can never be written by a Protestant in such a manner as to satisfy Catholics, nor by a Catholic in such a manner as to satisfy Protestants. The two points of view will always be distinct.

We quite agree with one critic who says that if we cannot have a history written from our own point of view, we ought to be thankful to authors who write in the spirit which prompted the writers of this book. As a justification of this declaration he points to the chapter on the Reformation settlement and the sympathetic account of the foundation and aims of the Jesuits. To offset so much praise, and lest the reader might think that no blemishes exist, another critic calls our attention to several assertions to which we cannot unreservedly subscribe. Nor is there any excuse for gentlemen of education who use the offensive words "Romanist" and "Popery." Mr. Tout does this.

To sum up, we have before us the best one volume history of England not written from a Catholic standpoint.

Lincoln's Plan of Reconstruction. By *Charles H. McCarthy, Ph. D.* (Pa.)

An historical essay, correct and logical in its statement of facts, and smooth and elegant in its diction, is rare enough to be worthy

of special attention, but when to this is added a subject matter entirely ignored by other writers it may well be pronounced a notable addition to historical literature. Dr. McCarthy's treatise on Lincoln's Plan of Reconstruction has all these merits, and others beside. The tragic death of the War President, and the seething tumult of "carpet-bagging" days seem to have distracted the attention of historians, and induced them to pass by the momentous period of which this author treats. The President's assassination and the violent controversy of Congress with his successor brought all Lincoln's efforts to naught, yet a knowledge of these plans and his labors in that behalf is necessary to a proper understanding of the times immediately following the great War. It is of this period of War Reconstruction, and down to the assembly of the Thirty-ninth Congress that Dr. McCarthy writes.

A general introduction tells of the rise of the slavery question, and the development of the doctrine of State Sovereignty and ushers in the War-time. The earlier chapters detail the efforts of President Lincoln to establish a loyal government in Tennessee, Louisiana and Arkansas, where the fortunes of war, or the drift of sentiment favored the Union cause. Much light is thrown on the question as to what might have been had not the hand of J. Wilkes Booth intervened. In passing we note the curious fact that Senator Andrew Johnson, to whom eventually fell the task of reconstruction, was chosen by the President for that purpose in the case of Tennessee. These efforts, for the most part based on the war powers of the President, eventually proved fruitless, and gave way to the Congressional Reconstruction in 1865. The creation of the new State of West Virginia is dwelt upon at length as being properly included within the scope of the treatise, and because of the intrinsic interest of the subject as a matter of constitutional law. It is, of course, of common knowledge that the war was not undertaken primarily for the destruction of slavery, and the series of events leading up to the famous Emancipation Proclamation, the opinions of the President in this respect and Congressional legislation is treated fully in one of the chapters. The reader is thus prepared for a discussion of the various theories and plans for reconstruction advanced by the leaders in the executive and legislative departments. The session of Congress commencing December, 1863, is analytically described, and extracts from original papers and the Congressional debates are given, but the skill of the author is shown in telling the story thus without conveying the impression of a mere digest or abstract of State papers. The merit of this method lies in the elimination of the opinion of the historian which so often distorts the ideas of the makers of history. The controversy between the President and

Congress is then set out at length, and is brought down to the assassination of Lincoln. So that the treatise may have the merit of unity, the period between the assumption of the Presidency by Johnson and the assembling of the Thirty-ninth Congress in December, 1865, is also recounted. Here the President's plans give way to the authority of Congress and the essay properly terminates.

Dr. McCarthy has handled his subject with skill and in minute detail. The footnotes indicate the scope of his researches and the original sources from which the information has been gleaned. In fact, it will be found impossible to understand properly the period following the Civil War without a careful study of the events herein narrated, and which are to be found collated in no other single volume. The treatise has already found its place among the standard works in American History.

THE TRIUMPH OF THE CROSS. By *Fra Girolamo Savonarola.* Translated from the Italian. Edited with Introduction by the Very Rev. Father John Procter, S. T. L., Provincial of the Dominicans in England. 12mo., pp. XXXI.—213.

The history and object of "The Triumph of the Cross," which may be considered the most important of the works, if we may so call them, of the great Florentine Reformer, is given by Echard, the Continuator of Quetif, in his "Scriptores Ordinis Prædicatorum."

The "Triumph of the Cross" is, he tells us, an accurate work, and one approved by all learned men. Savonarola undertook it for this special reason, namely, that he might clearly show what were his real feelings as regards the Catholic Faith and the Apostolic See; and that he might refute the calumnious accusation of heresy and schism, which had been laid to his charge by his adversaries. It begins thus: "The glorious triumph of the Cross over the worldly wise and over wordy sophists," etc. It is divided into four books, of which the first treats of the existence, nature and providence of God, and proves the immortality of the soul of man. In the second the author shows, by various arguments, how the Christian faith is in accord with truth and reason. He proceeds, in the third, to point out that there is nothing, intrinsically, or extrinsically, impossible in the chief mysteries of the Christian faith, and that they are not, in any way, at variance with reason. The fourth book is mainly devoted to an exposition of the truth of the religion taught by Christ. It shows that the vagaries of philosophers, astrologers, idolaters, Jews, Mohametans and heretics are absolutely opposed to reason.

This work was written in Latin, and appeared first in 1497. It has been reprinted many times since, but this is the first time that it has appeared, in its entirety, in English. It is very important in

view of the many disputes that have been going on for centuries in regard to Savonarola's orthodoxy, and that have been revived lately with more than ordinary heat on the occasion of his cenetnary. The editor complains very bitterly of an expurgated English edition of the book, which has been quoted many times by those who held that Savonarola was unsound in faith and disloyal to the Holy See. Indeed, he claims that most of the attacks on Savonarola in modern times can be traced to this imperfect translation. If this should be true, the importance of the present complete translation is quite apparent. The editor is willing to put his claim to the test. He says: "'Savonarola, the Dominican apologist, has written Credo in large letters over every page of 'The Triumph of the Cross.' It is the history of the religious opinions of his times. It is more. It is the exposition in writing of the doctrines which he preached, with such incomparable eloquence, from beginning to end of his apostolic life. It is his clear and uncompromising profession of faith to all time. It is his solemn anathema to heresy, of which, nevertheless, men have sometimes dared to accuse him. This book ought to lay the ghost of an accusation against the Florentine Reformer forever. It proclaims Savonarola's Catholicity beyond denial or doubt. It was intended to be his defense of the faith. It was written as his profession of belief. It was to be his Credo in life, and the echo of his belief after his death, when his voice was still, and he could no longer protest, as he did with such vigor in his lifetime, against his false accusers.

This faithful English translation of the whole of "The Triumph of the Cross" will, let us hope, reveal the true Savonarola, the Savonarola of fact and not of fiction, the Savonarola of history and not merely of romance, the Savonarola as mirrored in his own words, and not as misrepresented and distorted, and rendered beyond recognition by many who, whilst professing to extol him, and to add lustre to his name, have. in reality, belittled him and sullied his fair fame."

THE JESUIT RELATIONS AND ALLIED DOCUMENTS. Travels and Explorations of the Jesuit Missionaries in New France, 1610-1791. The Original French, Latin and Italian Texts, with English Translations and Notes. Illustrated by Portraits, Maps and Facsimiles. Edited by Reuben Gold Thwaites, Secretary of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin. Vols. 72 and 73. Final Preface, Additional Errata and Index. 8vo., pp. 380 and 398. Cleveland: The Burrows Brothers Co.

The truth that the end crowns the work is most aptly illustrated in the index to a book. It is the key which unlocks a treasure house; it is memory's handmaid; it is the student's guide. Without

it many valuable works are almost useless, because the busy reader has not time to search for the information which he needs; with it whole libraries are brought within his reach, and lay quickly before him their hidden truths. The indexing of books in general is a comparatively modern art. We have had indexes or concordances to more important works a long while ago, the first index to the Bible dating back to 1247, but now every work of importance has its index. In 1877 an Index Society was formed in England for the purpose of making and printing indexes of particular subjects, and of gradually preparing a universal index for reference.

It must be very gratifying to all students of history to know that the splendid reprint of the Jesuit Relations which the Burrows Brothers Company has been producing since the autumn of 1896 has been provided with an admirable index. The work itself is invaluable. There is no printed collection of original historical documents to be compared with it. There is no other historical work extant in which all the conditions for the production of historical truth are more perfectly present. The historians are holy, simple minded, learned men, writing for the eye of their superior only, as they would write for the eye of God, for they see in the superior God's representative. They set down exactly what occurred, as they saw it, without fear or favor, and not knowing that the narrative would ever appear before the world. This is history in the truest sense of the word, and yet it is the rarest kind of history. It would be a pity indeed if any one should tamper with these precious documents. To change them in any way would seem almost a sacrilege. The great value of this reprint is in its faithful reproduction of the original. The editor performed his work in the right spirit. He says:

"Approaching the task with no conscious prejudices of either race or religion, it has been the sole desire of the editor impartially to collect, preserve and annotate this great body of documents having so important a bearing upon the foundations of American history. An editor of historical sources cannot with propriety comment upon the character or the motives of the actors in the drama outlined upon his pages; sufficient that, without fear, favor or bias of any sort, he presents materials from which philosophical historians may construct their edifices."

The Index is up to the standard of excellence shown throughout the rest of the work. It is well arranged and very comprehensive. It is really a key. We have fitted it to the lock several times, and it always opened the door. Those who have this monumental work are to be congratulated. It will grow more valuable year by year, and scarcer, for it is not likely that owners will part with it.

THE ADORATION OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT. By *Rev. A. Tesnière*, Priest of the Congregation of the Blessed Sacrament. Translated by Mrs. Anne R. Bennett-Gladstone. 12mo., pp. 288. New York: Benziger Brothers.

What a consolation it is to every true Christian to see so many books on the Blessed Sacrament coming from the press. Surely it indicates an increasing faith in the real presence, and a growing love for the Eucharistic Saviour. If every good word is like a fruitful seed which, dropped on ready soil, brings forth good fruit, who can measure the great harvest which follows the publication of a good book. Sometimes one is tempted to think that too many books are written, and that more good might follow if the attention of readers were given to fewer. This might be so if truth could be stated in such a manner as to suit all capacities in one form and to attract them. But because the human mind is capable of so many changes, and such various degrees of development, truth must needs be presented to it in many forms and various costumes. The need for this variety and multiplication is increased when we consider that the purveyors of falsehood, taking the word in its wide sense, never tire of inventing new means to disseminate it.

Let us welcome, then, every grain of truth, no matter how humble, and do what we can to help it to fall on good ground, painfully conscious that much of it will be lost. It is most becoming that following the introduction of the Congregation of the Blessed Sacrament into this country, we should have introduced into our language so charming a work on the Blessed Sacrament by one of its members, as the book before us. It is divided into five parts treating of: The reasons of the Eucharist, The divine titles of the Eucharist, The human titles of the Eucharist, The motives of the Eucharistic adoration, and The Exposition of the Most Holy Sacrament.

Under each of these heads there are several chapters, each subdivided into Adoration, Thanksgiving, Reparation, Prayer and Practice. It is truly a work of devotion. Its pages speak to the heart and kindle the fire of love in it. When reading it we thought of the words of the disciples after Jesus had left them at Emmaus: "Was not our heart burning within us whilst He spoke in the way."

MADAME ROSÉLY. By *Mlle. V. Monniot.* Translated by Elvira Quintero and Jean Mack. 12mo., pp. 356. Philadelphia: John Joseph McVey.

A letter which the Bishop of Agen wrote to the author of this book is the best introduction that it could have: "I cannot thank you sufficiently for having sent me a copy of 'Madame Rosély.' It is a most interesting book, and certainly no one could read it and not be encouraged to imitate the examples of the noble characters it describes. In these days, when so many frivolous and useless books

are thrust upon the public, every thoughtful person will welcome with delight a work whose every page not only charms the reader, but also contains such sound moral lessons. I congratulate the author of 'Madame Rosély.' She thoroughly understands the dangrges to be encountered in the world, and faithfully portrays the ultimate success of a generous soul, who served God as faithfully in adversity as in prosperity. 'Madame Rosély' will undoubtedly do much good, and may even serve as a book of meditation."

The book is a collection of letters, very beautifully written and very skilfully arranged so as to make a connected story and teach excellent lessons without wearying the reader. Madame Rosély marries a widower, who lives with his mother and his two children, a boy and a girl, aged respectively 8 and 11. She goes to live in the same house with this family. Her husband's mother resents her coming, for she is opposed to her son's second marriage. She wished to continue head of his house. She tries to teach the children to hate their stepmother, and she finds an apt pupil in the girl. The boy, who is younger and has a better disposition, is pulled in several directions by his divided affections. When Madame Rosély becomes a mother her own child becomes a new cause of discord. Her husband suffers serious financial losses, and this makes her lot still harder.

It is easy to understand that such a situation offers a splendid field for the exercise of all virtues, natural and supernatural. Madame Rosély possesses them, and when she fails, her good Christian mother comes to her rescue. Most of the letters in the collection are written by mother to daughter, and daughter to mother, but other characters are introduced to complete the picture.

The book is particularly suitable for young girls, and it might be placed in the hands of all pupils at convent schools with great profit. The good mother, daughter, wife and Christian woman meets the reader in a manner so attractive as to claim imitation.

KINKEAD'S BALTIMORE SERIES OF CATECHISMS. Nos. 00, 0, 1, 2, 3. 16mo., paper. New York: Meany Printing Company, 110 West Eleventh street.

What catechism shall we use? is a question that is often asked, and seldom answered in the same way by many persons. Nearly every one has his favorite, which is generally the book that he used in childhood, and it is hard to get him away from his prejudice and induce him to consider the volume strictly on its merits. Hence we hear of new editions of old catechisms brought out from time to time by admiring friends, who believe that they are the best, because they never consider the merits of any other. Thinking men, and

especially educators, knowing that catechism is the most important of all studies, and realizing at the same time that it is the most difficult from the teacher's point of view, are always looking for the author who can make it easier. He is a hard man to find. It may seem an easy task to write a catechism, but those who have tried it know that it is most difficult. The best proof of this assertion is the number of failures that confront us. Indeed the number of successful learned works of philosophy and theology far exceed, making due allowance for the public demand, the number of successful catechisms.

There is a mysterious quality which distinguishes the good catechism from the bad one that is hard to define, but which is unmistakably present in one and absent from the other. It is easy for us to say that we should have uniformity in our catechisms, so that all children at all times and in all places may learn the same answers to the same questions. We may also assert truthfully that a catechism should be comprehensive, clear and simple. But all this does not fully explain why one is accepted and the other rejected, or one approved and the other disapproved. There seems to be something in the author's personality, in addition to his learning, training and other virtues natural and acquired, that completes the equipment of the successful author. The combination is rare. The author whose books are under notice on this page has it.

Father Kinkead has taken the Catechism of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore and rearranged it, and added to it, and explained it, until he has constructed a series that we believe will be found to answer all requirements. It has already received the most flattering commendations, and it is being adopted as it is becoming known. It has the quality of uniformity, because it is founded on the Baltimore Catechism, and it is unexcelled for comprehensiveness, clearness and simplicity.

THE LIFE OF BARTOLOMÉ DE LAS CASAS and the first leaves of American Ecclesiastical history. By *Rev. L. A. Dutto*. B. Herder: St. Louis, 1902. Price, $1.50 net.

In this volume of 592 pages the story of the first priest ordained in the Western Hemisphere is told by an American priest who possesses all the qualifications necessary for the task, except a perfect command of the English language. If his proof-sheets had been overhauled by some friendly hand, many ludicrous mistakes would have been corrected. However, since those of us to whom English is the vernacular are notoriously reluctant to submit to the drudgery of book-making, we have but little right to find fault with the

courageous efforts of our foreign-born colleagues to make good our deficiencies. "I have told in English," says Father Dutto, "*as well as I knew how* the story of the first American priest, that the ten thousand English-speaking American priests might have a mirror in which to reflect their own lives and a prototype to copy."

Our verdict, after reading the book, is that the author has done the main work very satisfactorily. Without endeavoring to canonize his hero, or descending to the level of a blind panegyric, he has set the amiable figure of the immortal Protector of the Indians before us just as he moved and acted. The total absence of any straining after rhetorical effect in the telling of the tale serves to enhance the interest of the story. The eminently successful efforts of Las Casas to preserve the aborigines from annihilation have been the subject of reiterated laudation on the part of writers of all classes, and they ought to be known and studied in detail by the American priests to whom they form an inheritance of glory.

A PRACTICAL COMMENTARY ON HOLY SCRIPTURE for the use of those who teach Bible History. By *Frederick Justus Knecht, D. D.*, Auxiliary Bishop of the Archdiocese of Freiburg. Translated and adapted from the sixteenth German edition. Preface by Rev. Michael F. Glancey, Chancellor of the Diocese of Birmingham. Second English edition revised. Vol. I., The Old Testament; Vol. II., The New Testament. Freiburg and St. Louis: B. Herder, 1901. Price of both volumes, $4.00 net.

In the year 1894 we extended a warm welcome to the valuable addition made to our meagre catechetical literature by Father Glancey's translation of Dr. Knecht's Commentary on Holy Scripture, a work highly prized by Catholic teachers in Germany, as was proved by the demand for twelve successive editions in the space of ten years. That the work continues to keep its place as the mainstay of German Catholic catechetical instruction is shown by the fact that it still maintains its glorious record of a new edition each year. No words of ours could add weight to the impressive eloquence of figures like these. In view of the limited demand for truly scientific works in English-speaking Catholic circles, there is some slight reason for congratulating Father Glancey upon the exhaustion of a single edition in six years. If our clerical readers will take our advice they will place a copy of this admirable work in the hands of each teacher of Bible history in their respective schools, and we pledge our word that they will be extremely gratified with the results obtained.

CATHOLIC STORIES. By Anna T. Sadlier, Clara Mulholland, Mary E. Waggaman, Emma H. Wight, Mary E. Mannix, Mary G. Bonesteel and Catharine Tynan Hynkson. 16mos., with frontispiece. New York: Benziger Brothers.

This series of short stories by well-known and approved Catholic authors will be welcomed with acclamations of delight by the little

ones for whom they are intended. It is a reading age, and children catch the fever very early. It is most important that the food for their minds should be carefully chosen. And yet in practice this is too often neglected. Newspapers with their scandals, magazines with their startling and sometimes shocking pictures, novels with their slurs at religion and good morals, and their approval of disobedience, disrespect for authority, parental, civil and ecclesiastical, and at least tacit approval of marital infidelity, are spread upon the family table and permitted to fall into the child's hands. Very often the poison is drunk with avidity and the harm done continues for years. If some parents were as careless about their children's stomachs as they are about their intellects, the little ones would die in a night of indigestion. If they must read, and the less they do of it in early years, the better, because of the difficulty of finding books suited to their capacity, at least furnish them with the best material at hand. The books before us can be recommended as bright, interesting, wholesome, and in every way safe. The attention of parents, guardians and teachers should be called to them.

CASUS CONSCIENTIAE PROPOSITI AC SOLUTI a *R. P. Eduardo Genicot, S. J.* Opus Postumum accomodatum ad Theologiae Moralis Institutiones Eiusdem Auctoris. Duo volumina, 8vo., pp. 428, 605. Lovanii: Typis et Sumptibus Polleunis et Ceuterick.

Theologians who have made the acquaintance of Father Genicot's excellent work on Moral Theology will welcome the present work, in which those principles which were stated so clearly, and explained so fully, receive their practical application. Coming from the press so soon after its elder sister makes it doubly welcome, because each calls attention to the excellence of the other, and the student can make the acquaintance of both at the same time.

Father Genicot's former work has already been reviewed in these pages, and it would be superfluous to say more now than that it wears well, and improves on acquaintance. We are sure that we can promise as much for the work before us.

"ORATE FRATRES:" collegit, disposuit, edidit *P. Gaudentius*, Ex-Definitor Generalis O. F. M. Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder, 1901. Price, $1.10 net.

This is a model prayer book for priests and seminarians. The arrangement is simple and easily understood. Every need of the soul has been considered and attended to. We specially laud the spirit of self-restraint which has kept the pious author from substituting new prayers of his own devising for the time-honored words of the saints. We strongly recommend the book to the devout clergy and to the superiors of seminaries.

70760

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

PERIODICAL